

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

Submission No: 510
Submitted by: Redlands2030 Inc.
Publication:
Attachments:
Submitter Comments:

From: [Steve MacDonald](#)
To: [State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee](#)
Cc: [Steve Macdonald](#)
Subject: Redlands2030 Incorporated submission about the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025
Date: Tuesday, 20 May 2025 4:50:01 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Committee Secretary
State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee
Parliament House, George Street, Brisbane QLD 4000
Email: SDIWC@parliament.qld.gov.au

Dear Committee Secretary

Redlands2030 Incorporated submission about the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025

Redlands2030 (R2030) is a not-for-profit community organisation located in Redland City. We are possibly better known for our advocacy in opposing the Toondah Harbour Priority Development Area. That exercise vindicated our objections when the Federal minister for Environment rejected the EIS submitted by the proponent. It should be noted that we eventually formed the Toondah Alliance comprising community and conservation groups from local, State and National organisations. One conclusion would have to be that the State Government's planning prowess was shown to be sadly deficient, which caused the community to mount a voluntary response to the EIS that meant 27 000 people and individuals added significant weight to the planning process and this was backed by a petition signed by 75 000 people. The reference to the Toondah debacle shows the level of community interest in the PDA planning process. The rush employed to deal with the **Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025** would in a proper consultation process and time line **might have garnered a comparable response**, and that would likely to have greatly improved the legislation. Short timeframes do not reflect well on the Government or its planning authority.

R2030 advocates to protect and improve the liveability of Redland City and supports the intent of the SEQ Community Alliance to promote sustainable, resilient and nature positive development and to ensure greater transparency and accountability in all planning and development related matters. At the heart of this approach is meaningful and adequately timed consultation. The consultation timeframe made available for this exercise is well short of best practice failing to acknowledge that community organisations need time to garner community capacity in responding to such challenges.

R2030 reviewed the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 (the Bill) and many aspects of the available

materials and make the following comments.

1. The Bill proposes significant changes to Queensland laws affecting planning, development approval, environmental protection and heritage protection which should have been the subject of extensive community consultation by the Government before being introduced to Parliament. The removal of landowner appeal rights is an attack on long held property rights and to see this property rights eliminated is an assault on property rights that defies long held conventions of Government, especially those of a conservative nature. Yet the removal of these rights is not an “up front” but rather a hidden impact of the Act.
2. The Bill includes measures which appear designed to slow down the development of renewable energy projects in Queensland. This will impede progress by Queensland in dealing with the climate emergency which is inflicted devastating weather events upon us.
3. While slowing down development of important renewable energy projects, the Bill proposes to exempt Olympic related activities from several laws which are there to ensure good governance of matters such as protecting Queensland’s environment and heritage. the top down pinning for Olympic projects probably reflects the growing concerns the community holds for the Games as a whole. In redland City the lack of community support for the whitewater facility to be built at Birkdale is an affront to the public interest and the transparency needed for planning processes. The Committee might like to be informed that about 75% of the City’s community are opposed to the construction of the whitewater facility. The changes mooted in the Act are actions that further over-ride the community’s values, expectations of Government and the public interest.
4. Queensland already has legal processes for Ministerial designated projects so there is no need for new legal processes specifically for development of projects for the Olympics.
5. Measures proposed in the Bill to ease development of Olympic related activities would conflict with Queensland’s contractual commitments to the International Olympic Committee (IOC). The circumvention of the contractual arrangements established for the Games by this Bill is demonstrating that the community values are being over ridden or ignored.

R2030 recommends that the Committee advise the Government to:

1. Withdraw the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025.
2. Consider an appropriate strategy and legislation for facilitating new renewable energy projects to assist Queensland in rapidly reducing its Greenhouse Gas Emissions.
3. Undertake a proper thorough review of Queensland’s planning laws which have, over recent years, eroded opportunities for community input. This review would be the appropriate way to examine requirements for developers to demonstrate social licence and community benefit and consider how these requirements should be applied to particular classes of projects.

4. Get on with delivering facilities for the 2032 Olympics using existing Queensland laws, and ensure that:
 - a. Development of Olympic venues and infrastructure does not adversely impact on places which have heritage and /or environmental significance:
 - b. Social licence and community benefit for the 2032 Olympics are earned through compliance with principles of good governance, including transparency.
- b.
5. Re-evaluate contentious plans to use both Victoria Park and the Birkdale Community Precinct for development of Olympic venues, and consider alternatives which are more likely to earn social licence.

R2030 has no objections to this submission being published. While we do apologise for the lateness of this submission it demonstrates the timeframe for submissions was always problematic, yet we do try to comply with these timelines.

Yours sincerely

Steve MacDonald

President Redlands2030 Inc.

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Web: [REDACTED]