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

Submission No: 359

Submitted by:

Publication: Making the submission public but withholding your name

Attachments: No attachment

Submitter Comments:

1. Why Victoria Park Matters Victoria Park / Barrambin is Brisbane's largest inner-city park. It spans over 64 hectares and is a rare green space for recreation, ecology, and cultural heritage. The site is deeply significant to Aboriginal peoples, and it also holds immense value for Brisbane's broader community. The Victoria Park Master Plan was developed after almost four years of community consultation so the surprise announcement of Olympic venues in Victoria Park is a shocking betrayal of community trust.Brisbane's green space is not vacant land. It is not a green field for construction. It is to be protected for future generations in perpetuity to maintain health, wellbeing and mental health. Of all Australian capital cities Brisbane has the least available green space. By constructing on this site we are essentially telling our future generations we do not care about their wellbeing, health or mental health, the significant cultural significance or living history of our ancestors. The overturning of legislation to enable this is doing exactly that. 2. Why a Stadium in Victoria Park Doesn't Make SenseBuilding a stadium in Victoria Park / Barrambin is impractical, environmentally damaging, and contrary to community interests. Key reasons include:1. Challenging Topography: The park's hilly terrain and hard Brisbane Tuff rock would require extensive excavation and blasting, increasing costs and potentially disrupting nearby hospitals due to vibrations.2. Violation of Olympic Host Requirements: Constructing a stadium here would breach the Olympic Host Contract, which mandates avoiding permanent structures in protected areas and prioritizing previously developed sites.3. Existing Traffic Congestion: The area already experiences significant traffic from nearby hospitals, schools, and universities. A stadium would exacerbate congestion, affecting emergency services and daily commutes.4. Inadequate Public Transport: Unlike other stadiums, Victoria Park lacks sufficient public transport access. The nearest station is a considerable walk away, posing challenges for attendees, especially those with mobility issues.5. Loss of Essential Green Space: As Brisbane's largest inner-city park, Victoria Park provides vital green space in a city already lacking in such areas. A stadium would significantly reduce this public amenity. There are mature native trees in this park which pre-date European settlement and date to pre-1750.6. Proximity to Major Hospital: The park is adjacent to the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital. Stadium events could disrupt hospital operations, affecting patient care and staff.7. Lack of Surrounding Amenities: The area lacks the bars, restaurants, and entertainment venues that typically support stadium events, leading to potential overdevelopment within the park itself.8. Environmental Impact: The park serves as a natural cooling area, mitigating urban heat. Development would increase heat retention and reduce air quality.9. Cultural Significance: Victoria Park holds deep cultural importance for First Nations communities. Development risks disturbing sacred sites and erasing historical significance.10. Every inch of Victoria Park is heritage listed at the local or state level. This land is part of the story of Brisbane and has a rich WWII and depression era history. 11. Community Opposition: There is strong public resistance to the stadium proposal, with concerns about environmental degradation, cultural disrespect, and loss of public space.3. What the Bill Would DoThe Bill proposes to list a Stadium in Victoria Park as an 'authority venue' for the 2032 Olympics. The Bill would exempt construction of such Olympics venues and villages from 15 Queensland planning, environmental and heritage laws. The Bill would also remove any access to the Courts in relation to the construction of Olympics venues or villages. It would also override First Nations cultural heritage protections using a new process which railroads First Nations into a default plan if they don't agree in the timeline specified by the Bill.4. Why This Should Concern QueenslandersThe Bill removes public safeguards by effectively exempting Olympic venues and villages from laws that apply to ordinary Queenslanders. This includes the

Planning Act, Heritage Act, and Environmental Protection Act. Access to the Courts is a basic right of all Queenslanders. The Bill proposes to remove this right with sweeping provisions in relation to Olympics venues and villages. The Bill introduces a fast-tracked cultural heritage scheme that limits consultation and allows default plans without the agreement of Traditional Owners. The potential use of public parkland for commercial Olympic 'villages' risks corruption. These exemptions from planning laws and court review bypass scrutiny and reduce transparency when privatising very valuable public assets.5. What I Am Asking the Committee to DoI 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.5. To choose another site such as Albion Raceway or Northshore as the Olympic stadium venue. Lastly, the 100 day review recommendations to government outlined that while Victoria Park was one of the possible sites, it did so with caution, by stating that further consultation with community needs to be undertaken. Because how could a 100 day review be so thorough, to review one of Qld's biggest successes in consultation submissions received. It is only second to the NDIS review, which took a year to undertake, and resulted in releasing chapters to give credit to all submissions received. Yet the 100 day review reduced the public submissions to a short list of dot points. Basically ignoring them.