

~~The member for Dalrymple is the worst offender, because he actually referred to my 2011 speech when he mentioned the Kirrama Range road in passing in parliament in July last year. I table the Hansard extract to demonstrate his hypocrisy.~~

~~Tabled paper: Extract from Hansard, Member for Dalrymple's speech, dated 12 July 2012.~~

~~So what about the contribution from the federal government? On 16 March this year it was reported in the *Innisfail Advocate* that the federal member for Kennedy had secured \$1 million from the Gillard government for the Kirrama Range road. On 19 March the member for Dalrymple repeated this announcement in this House. Then it was reported in the *Innisfail Advocate* on 23 March that the federal member for Kennedy had not in fact secured the funding at all. I would welcome the \$1 million from the federal government. Indeed, I said in this House in September 2011 that the federal government should contribute to reopening the Kirrama Range road, but we will have to wait and see if that money is forthcoming.~~

~~Since 2008 the financial position of the state government has deteriorated as a result of the waste and mismanagement of the former Bligh government. The Newman government is making the hard decisions to get Queensland back on track. I am very pleased that the Newman government has provided this opportunity for us to finally move forward and have this important local road reopened, particularly given the difficult financial position of the state budget.~~

~~This is the most generous amount of funding that has ever been made available for work on the Kirrama Range road, and I am proud that I have been able to secure this funding for the benefit of the people and the communities I represent. I have not done a backflip on the Kirrama Range road. I have not changed my position. I have focused on getting an outcome for the communities that I represent and it has resulted in us having a real chance to get this important road open. That is what my community wanted, and I have delivered that. The reality is that the gutter politics from the Labor Party and the Katter party has put at risk the funding offer being accepted by the council, and now we have overcome that problem. The Labor Party and the Katter party put politics before people and communities. I am focused on getting on with the job.~~

~~**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! The time for matters of public interest has expired.~~

016

~~HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE~~

~~Membership~~

~~**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (11.59 am), by leave, without notice: I move—~~


~~That the member for Redcliffe, Mr Driscoll, be discharged from the Health and Community Services Committee and the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Bates, be appointed to the committee.~~

~~Question put—That the motion be agreed to.~~

~~Motion agreed to.~~

QUEENSLAND RAIL TRANSIT AUTHORITY BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. SA EMERSON** (Indooroopilly—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (12.00 pm): I present a bill for an act to establish the Queensland Rail Transit Authority, and for related purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Queensland Rail Transit Authority Bill 2013.

Tabled paper: Queensland Rail Transit Authority Bill 2013, explanatory notes.

The Newman government is taking steps to continue the reform program already underway in Queensland Rail to build a better rail business. Much work has been done over the past 12 months to improve services, efficiency and affordability. An additional 150 services have already been delivered on the Ferny Grove and Gold Coast lines. More work needs to be done if we want to drive down the cost of fares and deliver more services. The Newman government is proposing to change Queensland Rail to a statutory authority. Queensland Rail currently receives about 80 per cent of its funding directly from the government. As the previous government sold off the profit-making parts of

the business, it makes no sense for Queensland Rail to continue as a government owned corporation. This change will also bring Queensland Rail closer to government, not closer to privatisation. Queensland Rail will have a greater customer focus and deliver better train services. It will also help make it more efficient. This means Queensland Rail can employ more train crew to deliver better services and add more trains to the network. This is a great state with great opportunity. This change will help us deliver great rail services for Queenslanders. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. SA EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (12.02 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Question put—That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.


Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee.

~~BUILDING AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL~~

~~Introduction~~

 **Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (12.02 pm): I ~~present a bill to amend the Building Act 1975, the South East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 and the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008 and to make minor amendments of the Acts mentioned in the schedule. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee to consider the bill.~~

~~Tabled paper: Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.~~

~~Tabled paper: Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, explanatory notes.~~

~~The Building and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 will cut red tape by streamlining the development application process for building over or near sewers, water mains and stormwater drains. Currently there is no state-wide standard, which means the process is confusing, illogical and ad hoc. Let me explain the hoops that applicants for a building development approval often have to jump through just to be able to build a house or shed on their own property. Before work can start, you need to get a building development approval. However, the Building Act currently does not allow a private building certifier to grant approval for building work over, or adjacent to, a sewer or water main without the consent of the relevant service provider under the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act. I will refer to this legislation as the water supply act from now on.~~

~~Having to obtain consent from a service provider can also trigger a requirement to lodge a planning development application with the relevant local government which then has to be assessed under that local government's planning scheme or policies. To make things more confusing, the water supply act does not set out any criteria that the applicant must address to obtain consent, nor does it detail the process to be followed when making an application. Furthermore, the act does not provide design standards that would inform the applicant about whether it would be appropriate to build over or near the infrastructure in the first place. This lack of consistency is confusing for applicants and building certifiers, costs them time and money and is something that this bill intends to correct. Needless to say, negotiating your way through this process can involve outlaying a substantial sum of money on various fees and charges. Fees vary across service providers and local government areas, but planning approvals alone can be up to \$735. When factoring in all of the approvals, the total costs can reach \$2,000 or more just to construct a small shed. Also of concern is the current absence of any mechanism to allow applicants to appeal an unfavourable decision. This is unacceptable and something that this bill will rectify.~~

~~Amendments in this bill will remove the requirement for applicants to obtain consent from service providers or local governments. Instead, building work over or near relevant infrastructure will be assessed as part of the building assessment provisions under the Building Act. As a consequence,~~