

Committee Secretary
State Department, Natural Resources and Agriculture
Industry Development Committee
Parliament House
George Street
Brisbane 4000

Submitted by Judy Spence

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Vice President Save Our Broadwater

Save Our Broadwater is supportive of the Implementation of The Spit Master Plan Bill 2019.

We are particularly encouraged by the vision that is set out in the Explanatory notes which unfortunately is not included in the Bill itself. Delivering the intent of the Master Plan and the Bill itself, would be much stronger if these aims were set out in the Bill itself.

We appreciate that this Bill represents a simple and functional way to start delivering the \$60 million of infrastructure that the Government has committed to implementing the Spit Master Plan. We applaud this legislation as a convenient first step in ensuring the capital works commence.

The inclusion of the map in the legislation is useful. This map should include Curlew Island as well. There needs to be an amendment to the Land Act 1994 to reference the change of status and Community Purpose of Curlew Island, "to be appropriately zoned and managed to protect its environmental values". (The Spit Master Plan p54 2.9) This change could be enacted with this legislation.

In the long-term the community would like to see stronger environmental protection put over The Spit and its surrounding waterways. It would also like to see a stronger and more wholistic management regime than currently exists. There are many management issues that are currently contested about the uses of Spit land of which the Waterways Authority has no jurisdiction.

As an example, Seaworld has leased up 150 car parks to a private company to build a heliport with a 1000 square metre hanger. The company is running short joy rides. Seaworld now has an application submitted for more car spaces. Marina Mirage has a lease which states that "the lessee shall not carry out or allow to be carried out upon the leased land, any offensive, noxious or noisome occupation or business". Yet they currently lease a space as a heliport which has three helicopters operating five-minute flights so potentially one helicopter per minute is taking off or landing. This noisome activity is disturbing residents and recreational users of the Spit and it is seemingly unregulated. There are multiple government agencies at all three levels of government responsible for the decision making involved in these decisions, but little responsibility is accepted for problem solving or long-term planning by any of them.

The helicopter issue is just one example of the contested uses of the Spit and Waterways. We could provide many more.

The Spit Masterplan is not just about improving capital improvements to the public amenity, it is a visionary document that sets out a long-term future of The Spit. As explained in the Explanatory Notes, it aims to

- enhance the public realm of The Spit to create a community space for local residents
- improve connections to the surrounding marine environment, including The Broadwater
- generate opportunities for job creation through tourism, entertainment and recreation; and
- find the right balance between protecting environmental and community values and facilitating appropriate development opportunities.

In order to achieve these aims a much better management authority is going to be needed than the Waterways Authority with its proposed new responsibility to deliver capital works.

There will always be competition concerning the public and private users of The Spit just as there are conflicts between the different recreational users of it. Undoubtedly this will increase in the future as more people use the new and improved facilities that are going to be created.

The Master Plan is a visionary document and its implementation is going to create community debate and require a holistic management approach for many years. While the legislation at hand offers a short-term solution to deliver capital works, it does not provide a mechanism to deliver the shared vision for the long-term future of The Spit. Who will be responsible for finding the right balance between protecting environmental and community values and facilitating appropriate development opportunities?

Save Our Broadwater also believes board members should be more recognized in the community and have a stronger connection to The Spit and Broadwater.

Save Our Broadwater notes the committee is having two public hearings into this legislation this week. It seems only public servants have been invited to appear before the committee. While the committee system was designed to provide backbenchers with an opportunity to have legislation explained to them and have the opportunity to question bureaucratic decision making, it was also meant to be an opportunity for Members of Parliament to engage with members of the public in open forum. It is disappointing that your committee has not availed itself of the opportunity to do so.