

Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025

Submission No: 225
Submitted by: Josie Lander
Publication:
Attachments:
Submitter Comments:

Submission to the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee

Regarding : Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation
Amendment Bill 2025 (the Bill)

Made by : Josie Lander

Email address : [REDACTED]

Mailing address : [REDACTED]

Thank you for considering my thoughts on issues within the Bill, which are regarding the amendments to the Olympics Act.

1. I have serious concerns about the building of an approximately 60,000 seat stadium, a warmup track and other associated facilities, and the National Aquatic Centre, in Barrambin Victoria Park. From my point of view, Barrambin is a precious resource for Brisbane that needs to remain a green space. The trees and other plants significantly mitigate the impact of a hot climate and improve air quality. As Brisbane's inner-city population continues to increase, we really need our large accessible green spaces for good mental and physical health. This park is an *irreplaceable asset* to the city, and constructing a stadium would undermine its historical, cultural, and environmental significance. It is also listed on the Queensland Heritage Register due to its great cultural significance (since 2007, and the northern part was added very recently).
2. I am appalled that the government is introducing this bill, in part, to ensure opposition to the development of Olympic venues is stymied. That is what the "requirement" for streamlining the approvals process boils down to. This government, and the previous one, have created this risk to the Olympic and Paralympic games. This Bill is not a good solution. It sends the message that the government intends to allow projects that will be non-compliant with some or all of these 15 laws. If they were demonstrably compliant, then there would be no grounds for opposition and appeals.
3. I do not believe the government's assertion that we have run out of time. Paris had 7 years (awarded in 2017, held in 2024). I realise it is not a like for like comparison, I'm just saying it is not an unusual amount of time to have. 7 years is not a near impossible timeline, demanding extreme measures like this Bill. There is inadequate justification for conferring immunity from proceeding. Why not dis-allow frivolous or vexatious cases only, as properly determined, independently of the government, property developers and so on? Why not establish a streamlined, fast tracked appeals process? I just don't understand the need to trample all over our rights and *destroy* a precious cultural and environmental site such as Barrambin Victoria Park in order for the games to be "memorable" (100 day review). Read ego boosting for a few politicians and Olympic officials. The two events typically span 28 days. That's it. This is a totally insufficient rationale for choosing our park as the site for both the aquatic centre and a stadium.

4. The government as per the host contract (VEN 08 and 09) is supposed to "Ensure no permanent Olympic or Paralympic construction occurs **in** statutory nature areas, cultural protected areas and World Heritage sites... If the Host/OCOG proposes to locate a venue, facility and/or infrastructure **close to** a protected natural and/or cultural heritage area, an independent assessment of environmental (flora, fauna, soil, water and ecosystem services) and/or cultural heritage (landscape, amenity, built heritage and archaeology) constraints, potential impacts, risks and mitigation requirements shall be undertaken and submitted to the IOC for approval." (my emphasis) There seems, therefore, no point in ditching the Environmental and Cultural Heritage laws, as the government has undertaken not to build stadiums or anything permanent, in areas like Barrambin Victoria Park.
5. I was told by my local councillor that public private partnership deals would be done to reduce the cost of the Olympics to the taxpayer. Without the normal checks and balances, provided by the 15 planning, environment and heritage laws which would be sidelined by this Bill, what is to stop corruption and dirty deals being done?
6. I have also read that villages may also be built on Barrambin Victoria Park; this being an open secret in the construction industry.¹ Does this Bill allow the state government to sell extremely valuable publicly owned park land without the right of appeal? Does it allow the government to do some kind of public private partnership deal that allows residential/commercial development in the park? All without citizens being able to bring a civil court action, or seek judicial review?

I respectfully ask that your report to Parliament recommend that:

1. Victoria Park / Barrambin be removed from Schedule 1 (Authority Venues)
2. The cultural heritage override provisions be withdrawn
3. Olympic developments be subject to existing Queensland laws like all other developments
4. The Victoria Park Master Plan be upheld as a reflection of the community's vision for the park.

Kind regards,
Josie Lander

¹ NinoxLaw (8 May 2025) "Rule of Law, Separation of Powers, Privative Clauses and the Olympics"