

## Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Amendment Bill 2024

**Submission No:** 12  
**Submitted by:** City of Gold Coast  
**Publication:**  
**Attachments:**  
**Submitter Comments:**

Date: 30 April 2024  
Contact: Tim Baker  
Location: [REDACTED]  
Telephone: [REDACTED]  
Our reference: A99554602

Committee Secretary  
Housing, Big Build and Manufacturing Committee  
Parliament House  
George Street  
Brisbane QLD 4000

Via email: [hbbmc@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:hbbmc@parliament.qld.gov.au)

Dear Committee Secretary

### **Call for submissions - Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Amendment Bill 2024**

The Council of the City of Gold Coast (City) welcomes the opportunity to provide further comment on the *Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Amendment Bill 2024*.

With regard to this legislation, the City, as requested, submitted its feedback on the Bill to the Brisbane 2032 Coordination Office, with the majority of our feedback incorporated into the draft amendment to the Bill. We appreciate the spirit of partnership and collaboration that was displayed in the early drafting of the proposed amendments.

In addition, the City followed up on 11 April 2024 with a further request for an amendment to Clause 12 - Part 3, Division 2, s17 (Composition), Section 17, to include the Gold Coast Mayor on the Board of the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee.

#### **17 Composition**

(1) The board consists of the following persons (each a *director*)—

...

(k) 1 person who is nominated by the Lord Mayor in accordance with section 20;

(l) the Lord Mayor;

(m) the City of Gold Coast Mayor.

Regrettably, the City has again been overlooked when seeking to be involved in this critical decision-making forum, despite being a Co-Host City. The Games Delivery Partners, including Brisbane City and Sunshine Coast Councils, share a collaborative responsibility in the planning, preparation and delivery of the 2032 Games. The City has made a commitment and significant contribution to the Games through our Delivery Partner Guarantee Deed and it is imperative that the City be afforded the appropriate stakeholder status.

Worthy of note, a submission by the Australian Olympic Committee (AOC) requesting amendment to the Bill, to ensure any President of the Australian Olympic Committee and any honorary life President of the Australian Olympic Committee, hold a position on the board was accepted and included in the draft amendments tabled at Parliament.

As a City, we want to unite and work together with all levels of government and partners to ensure we plan and deliver the best Games on record, but importantly, ensuring we secure a lasting benefit for the Queensland communities.

I enclose herewith (below), detail on our outstanding concerns and request for change through this submission opportunity.

I trust this information is useful and I would welcome the opportunity to discuss our submission with you further.

Yours faithfully



Tim Baker  
**Chief Executive Officer**  
Council of the City of Gold Coast

Enc.

cc. Tom Tate, Mayor

**Submission feedback**

Clause	Feedback / comments
<p><b>General</b></p>	<p>The Gold Coast is a co-host and key delivery partner of the Olympic and Paralympic Games Brisbane 2032. The Roles and Responsibilities matrix developed and adopted as part of the Deloitte governance work identifies that Brisbane City Council (BCC), Sunshine Coast Council (SCC) and City of Gold Coast (CoGC) have equivalent role and responsibility. The complexities of games delivery across BCC, SCC and CoGC are no different.</p> <p>As a co-host and key delivery partner, the planning, preparation and delivery of the Olympic and Paralympic Games Brisbane 2032 reflects on the Gold Coast, presenting a reputational risk to the City. It also holds opportunity for long-term legacies for the City. These impacts need to be considered and taken seriously by the government as part of this legislation.</p> <p>The City of Gold Coast has signed numerous commitments, with significant resource investment, to ensure a successful games as part of the games delivery partners model. It is not acceptable that the City is excluded from key areas of consultation and agreement.</p>
<p><b>Clause 12 - Part 3, Division 2, s17 (Composition), Section 17(1)</b></p>	<p><b>Amendment requested.</b></p> <p>Under Part 3 Board of Directors, Division 2 Composition, Section 17 Composition of the Act, sub-paragraph (1) the addition of sub-paragraph (1)(m) 'City of Gold Coast Mayor'.</p> <p><b>17Composition</b></p> <p>(1)The board consists of the following persons (each a <i>director</i>)—</p> <p>...</p> <p>(k) 1 person who is nominated by the Lord Mayor in accordance with section 20;</p> <p>(l) the Lord Mayor;</p> <p>(m) the City of Gold Coast Mayor.</p>

Clause	Feedback / comments
<p><b>53AD Functions 1 (c) to co-ordinate and integrate the planning and delivery of State, Commonwealth and local government obligations under the host contract</b></p>	<p>As discussed in our overview briefing with the State on 21 February 2024, we do not believe that the entity has a place in overseeing programs such as Security, City Readiness and Operations, etc., and that in fact it is a duplication of effort. i.e., Security is clearly the brief of QPS leading and coordinating, as is City Readiness and Operations, clearly the responsibility of the local governments to lead and coordinate. It appears this would be creating a whole industry to take away the responsibility from the accountable parties.</p> <p>If legacy coordination should remain the responsibility of a temporary entity, will this derive the sustainable legacy aspirations desired by Games Delivery Partners and the community? To this end, City of Gold Coast acknowledges the proposed new section 53 AE.</p>
<p><b>53AE (e)</b></p>	<p>City of Gold Coast would request that there is an obligation for the authority to act in good faith with all Games delivery partners not only the corporation.</p>
<p><b>53AI (2)(b) &amp; (3)</b></p>	<p>City of Gold Coast would request the insertion of a limitation that the 'measures' and 'other matters' be reasonable.</p>
<p><b>53AJ (1) (a) – (h)</b></p>	<p>The City of Gold Coast requests consultation on any Strategy that impacts our city as we own, finance, and control a large portion of the transport network.</p> <p>As the majority owner of the transport network on the Gold Coast, City of Gold Coast needs to be added to the consultation and approval list.</p>
<p><b>53AL (2)</b></p> <p><b>53AL (5)(a)</b></p> <p><b>53AL (9)</b></p>	<p>City of Gold Coast would request any written direction is issued by the State and the authority is to act reasonably and in good faith when making a recommendation to the State to issue a written direction.</p> <p>City of Gold Coast would request there be an obligation for the authority to act reasonably and in good faith when considering a submission.</p> <p>City of Gold Coast would request the inclusion of an immunity in regard any breach of legislation or law by a recipient complying with the written direction.</p>
<p><b>53AM (4)</b></p>	<p>City of Gold Coast requests a wording change to ensure Local Government partners endorsement on the coordination plan.</p> <p>City of Gold Coast would request that there is an obligation for the authority to act in good faith.</p>
<p><b>53AR (1) &amp; (3)</b></p>	<p>City of Gold Coast would request that there is an obligation for the authority to act reasonably and in good faith.</p>

Clause	Feedback / comments
<p>53AS (1)(a) &amp; (b)</p> <p>53AS (2)(c)</p> <p>53AS (3)(c)</p>	<p>City of Gold Coast would request consideration of how infrastructure charges may be levied by the relevant Local Government, noting for ss53R(1)(a) a Development Approval is not required for accepted development, which triggers the levying of infrastructure charges and for ss53R(1)(b) under section 113(3)(b) Planning Act 2016 a Local Government cannot levy an adopted charge for providing trunk infrastructure for development in a PDA under the Economic Development Act.</p> <p>City of Gold Coast requests confirmation that the Local Government (Robina Central Planning Agreement) Act 1992 has been considered when drafting this clause. Is there an assumption that a new planning framework will be in place over Robina Central?</p> <p>City of Gold Coast would request that there is an obligation for the authority to act in good faith.</p> <p>City of Gold Coast would request that the Minister must also have regard to any planning instruments made by a Local Government for the relevant area.</p>
53AU (3) & (4)	City of Gold Coast would request that there is an obligation for the authority to act in good faith and the inclusion of an obligation to consult with the relevant Local Government.
53AZ	City of Gold Coast would request that there is an obligation for the authority to act reasonably and in good faith.
53BH (1) (a) – (i)	As a Co-Host City and key delivery partner of the Olympic and Paralympic Games Brisbane 2032, holding equivalent role and responsibility as BCC (as endorsed in the governance model), and the fact that this entity will be making decisions impacting permanent legacy for the Gold Coast and reputational risk, City of Gold Coast acknowledges inclusion on the Selection panel for nomination of directors and chairperson.