



INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr J Pearce MP (Chair)
Mr GJ Butcher MP
Mr MJ Hart MP
Mr S Knuth MP
Mrs BL Lauga MP
Mr LL Millar MP

Staff present:

Dr J Dewar (Research Director)
Ms M Telford (Principal Research Officer)
Ms M Westcott (Principal Research Officer)

PUBLIC BRIEFING—EXAMINATION OF THE QUEEN'S WHARF BRISBANE BILL 2015

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 2016

Brisbane

WEDNESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 2016

Committee met at 9.00 am

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open the public briefing for the committee's examination of the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill 2015. Thank you for your attendance here today. My name is Jim Pearce. I am the member for Mirani and chair of the committee. The other committee members here with me today are: Mr Michael Hart, the deputy chair and member for Burleigh; Mr Glenn Butcher, the member for Gladstone; Mrs Brittany Lauga, the member for Keppel; and Mr Lachlan Millar, the member for Gregory. Mr Shane Knuth, the member for Dalrymple, will be in and out for most of the day. You are probably aware that he is discussions with the Premier on a couple of issues.

Those here today should note that these proceedings are being broadcast to the web and media might also be present, so it is possible that you might be filmed or photographed. The briefing is also being transcribed by Hansard.

This briefing is a formal committee proceeding and as such you should be guided by schedule 8 of the standing orders. The aim of the briefing today is for the committee to gather preliminary information in relation to the bill.

I now welcome representatives from the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, the Department of State Development and Queensland Treasury.

EDWARDS, Mr David, Projects Chief Executive Officer, Department of State Development

FORD, Mr David, Deputy Director-General, Liquor, Gaming and Fair Trading, Department of Justice and Attorney-General, and Commissioner for Liquor and Gaming

GRIFFITHS, Ms Jayne, Principal Planner, Economic Development Queensland Planning, Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

JORGENSEN, Ms Hannah, Principal Project Officer, Queen's Wharf Brisbane, Department of State Development

LAWSON, Mr Matthew, Project Director, Queen's Wharf Brisbane, Department of State Development

LEACH, Mr Tom, Manager, Economic Development Queensland Planning, Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

CHAIR: Would anybody like to make an opening statement?

Mr Ford: I have a brief one, if that is helpful, which will give a fairly quick overview of the very varied bits and pieces in this legislation. Thank you for your invitation to provide the committee with a briefing on the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill 2015. As you would already be aware, last year the government announced the Destination Brisbane Consortium as the successful proponent for the Queen's Wharf Brisbane integrated resort development project.

The Queen's Wharf Brisbane integrated resort development project is a significant infrastructure project for Queensland which will redevelop the state owned land between George Street and the Brisbane River and Alice Street and Queen Street. The area includes the site of the existing Treasury Casino & Hotel, local roads, riverfront lands and a portion of the Riverside Expressway. The area has been declared a priority development area by the minister for Economic Development Queensland to facilitate the planning and delivery of the redevelopment.

The consortium anticipates works to commence onsite from January 2017 and for the integrated resort development to be completed by mid-2022. The key objectives of the project are to:

stimulate broad investment and economic development in the long-term future of Brisbane as a new world city, focusing on tourism and construction; redefine public access and transport connections into, through and around the Brisbane city centre; deliver an internationally recognised precinct with world-class sustainable urban design and architecture that establishes a clear identity that is uniquely Brisbane and Queensland; promote social interaction and a broad range of urban activities from the city centre down to the river's edge; and transform and activate places and spaces that draw people to Brisbane.

The Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill will put in place the necessary policy and legislative framework to support the redevelopment project. As such, the main purposes of the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill are to: exclude the application of the certain property and planning legislative provisions which are not intended to apply to large-scale developments; provide for a process to ratify the Queen's Wharf Brisbane casino agreement, which is a legislative requirement for the grant of a casino licence for the new Queen's Wharf casino; provide an appropriate regulatory framework to maintain the integrity of casino operations and those involved or associated with the conduct of casino operations; and give effect to a range of casino regulatory matters negotiated between the state and the proponent. I will now outline these purposes in more detail for the committee.

One of the purposes of the bill is to exclude certain property and planning legislative provisions that are not intended to apply to large-scale developments. The bill provides exemptions to various provisions in the Property Law Act 1974, the Land Act 1994, the Land Title Act 1994, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Act 2008 and the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994 so that, among other things, the commercial outcomes negotiated by the state can be achieved.

For example, the state will require the establishment of public thoroughfares through the precinct to enhance public accessibility. Other amendments will streamline the leasing of Land Act land to the state and the consortium to promote the activation of the precinct around the water's edge. The bill also amends the Economic Development Act 2012 to establish a process for the minister for Economic Development Queensland to determine that certain development proposals to be located outside a priority development area is PDA associated development.

The consortium's proposal includes a bridge over the Brisbane River from the proposed development area to South Bank Parklands. The proposed bridge is only partially in the priority development area. As a result, the development application process for the bridge would be uncoordinated and would require approval from both the minister for Economic Development Queensland for the portion within the priority development area and the Brisbane City Council, exercising its assessment powers under the South Bank Corporation Act 1989, for the assessment of a portion over the river and the land in the South Bank Corporation area.

In order to simplify the development application across multiple planning jurisdictions, the Department of State Development and Economic Development Queensland considered a range of options to allow for coordinated and streamlined assessment for the bridge, with a strong preference for a single assessment authority. Their preferred approach is a legislative amendment to allow the minister for Economic Development Queensland to approve and condition the portion of the bridge outside the priority development area. This will require an amendment to the Economic Development Act and the South Bank Corporation Act.

The bill also provides for the ratification of a casino agreement for the Queen's Wharf casino. In recognition of the financial commitment required to deliver such a world-class tourism, leisure and entertainment precinct, a casino licence has been offered for a casino within the integrated resort in the precinct. The casino licence is to be subject to initial geographical exclusivity for 25 years and run for 99 years after the commencement of casino operations.

The Casino Control Act requires that a casino agreement be made between the state and the consortium prior to the grant of the licence. The Casino Control Act also requires that casino agreements be ratified by the parliament in order for them to have any force or effect. As such, schedule 1 of the bill contains the Queen's Wharf casino agreement that is proposed to be entered into by the minister on behalf of the state and the consortium.

The casino agreement identifies the area within the priority development area within which the casino will be located and outlines a number of matters relating to the grant of a casino licence, including the terms on which it will be granted, the calculation of casino tax, the reporting and other obligations of or in relation to relevant entities, confidentiality requirements and the grant of an associated liquor commercial special facility licence.

The bill has been drafted to provide a proposed agreement in schedule 1 and for this agreement to then be approved by regulation for it to be taken as ratified by the Legislative Assembly, as the agreement had not been executed at the time of the bill's introduction. Amendments are intended to be introduced during the consideration in detail stage of the bill to replace the proposed agreement currently in the bill with the final executed signed agreement for parliament's ratification.

To ensure that the management and operation of the Queen's Wharf casino remains free from criminal influence and to maintain the good reputation of casino gaming in Queensland, the bill contains provisions which aim to make sure the casino licensee and other related entities or persons are suitable to be associated or connected with the ownership, management or operation of a hotel-casino complex.

These provisions identify various relevant entities that are associated with the ownership of the casino licensee and impose various requirements and restrictions on persons wishing to acquire voting powers or relevant interests in interests in convertible securities in casino licensees and related entities. For example, any person wishing to acquire voting power, or relevant interests in interests or convertible securities in the casino licensee or any related entities must seek the prior approval of the minister or Governor in Council, as the case may be, if their voting power or relevant interests will exceed the prescribed holding thresholds. The bill will enable a regulation to be made that requires a person to give to the minister or a specified relevant entity information known to the person about any matter related to interests or convertible securities in the specified relevant entity.

The bill will also establish a beneficial ownership tracing regime that will apply to any relevant entity which does not fall currently under the scope of the beneficial ownership tracing provisions in the Corporations Act and require new holding entities of a relevant entity, new trustees of relevant entity trusts of which a consortium party is a trustee and certain other persons to accede to the Queen's Wharf Brisbane casino agreement.

These requirements are significantly more detailed and reflect a more far-reaching regulatory position than currently imposed to address the more complex corporate and operational structure surrounding the development of the Queen's Wharf casino and to futureproof the provisions against future changes in structure. The provisions have also been provided for in the body of the agreement act rather than in the agreement itself, which will allow their application to relevant persons who are not parties to the agreement. It is intended that this new approach will be considered as a potential model for any future casinos and be taken into consideration when a broader review of the Casino Control Act is undertaken.

Additionally, the bill amends the Casino Control Act to enable the minister to undertake probity investigations into the casino licensee and all other persons connected with the ownership, management or operations of the casino licensee at any time after the Queen's Wharf Brisbane agreement is entered into. The bill also makes amendments to the Casino Control Act to facilitate the agreement and to give effect to a range of negotiated matters between the state and the proponent.

These include amendments to: allow a casino licence to be granted to a person who may not yet have been granted a lease from the state of the land to be used for the proposed hotel-casino complex but who has nevertheless entered into an agreement to lease the land to be used for the proposed hotel complex from the state; enable the Queen's Wharf casino operator, and all other Queensland casino operators, to extend credit to non-Queensland resident junket participants for gaming and allow such participants to make deposits into their player accounts by credit card; and allow for a casino licence to be issued on conditions and for a contravention of a condition to be a ground for cancellation or suspension of the casino licence.

Lastly, the bill makes a number of clarifying amendments to the Casino Control Act, the Brisbane Casino Agreement Act 1992 and the Liquor Act 1992 to make clear that: a casino operator may allow a person to use a debit card to deposit an amount into the person's player account; the definition of Brisbane casino in the Brisbane Casino Agreement Act refers to the Treasury Casino and not the proposed Queen's Wharf casino; the ordinary trading hours of 10 am to 12 midnight do not apply to premises to which a commercial special facility licence for a casino relates; and lockout provisions under the Liquor Act do not apply to licensed premises to which a commercial special facility licence for a casino relates.

That is a very quick overview for the committee. This bill has been a major joint effort across a number of agencies including my department, the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, which is leading the bill in the parliament, the Department of State Development, the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Queensland Treasury. As such, we have

representatives from across these agencies here ready to answer any questions the committee may have about the bill. Thank you, Mr Chairman, for the opportunity to brief the committee this morning.

CHAIR: Thank you for that overview. As you understand there will be a lot of questions around what you have covered there. We will simply want you to go into more detail. I will start with the policy objectives of the bill which are to facilitate the redevelopment of the Queen's Wharf Brisbane precinct by excluding the application of certain property and planning legislative provisions which are not intended to apply to large-scale developments. Could you go into a little more detail with regard to that policy objective so we get a better understanding of the reasons these provisions are not intended to apply to large-scale developments?

Mr Edwards: The reason we have amended several of those acts is to facilitate the agreement that we have made between the state and the proponent. It is a large-scale development. It is quite complex. It has a combination of freehold and leasehold land. We are significantly changing the nature of the development in that area. It is really to facilitate and fast-track that development. I might ask Matt to give a couple of specific examples maybe on the easement part of things and the also the Land Act specifically.

Mr Lawson: As David said, it really is about facilitating the development. A lot of the existing legislation does not necessarily contemplate the context of such a major project. There are detailed tenure and technical issues as well as commercial issues which flow out of that which, in the context of a much larger transaction and much broader project objectives, were considered inconsistent and perhaps an unnecessarily administrative burden in facilitating the project.

CHAIR: Are you driven by the dreams of the developer? I guess there would be legislative restrictions as well that you would have to apply, but as this development is a coordinated project—just like in the mining industry where the Coordinator-General can declare a coordinated project—it is very helpful to the proponent. I am interested to know who points out to whom what needs to be done. Does much pressure come from the developer itself?

Mr Edwards: No. A good example is the easements that were required to be created. That requires an exemption from the Land Act and the Transport Infrastructure Act. We are creating and registering a new public thoroughfare through the precinct. The state will benefit from that from a public perspective, but that land will be sold to Destination Brisbane Consortium. It is to ensure that that public easement can be facilitated but, more importantly, the state is not responsible for the maintenance of that public easement. It is contained in the agreement that the Destination Brisbane Consortium is responsible for the maintenance of it. It is clarifying those aspects so the state can deliver on its commitment to create the public easement and the proponent delivers on its commitment to maintain that public easement, whereas the state would normally do that for public realm. That is one example.

CHAIR: Thank you for that. What impact could a PDA associated development have on a council's ability to charge for infrastructure?

Mr Leach: The Minister for Economic Development Queensland collects infrastructure charges for a PDA, but I might have to take that on notice and get back to you on exactly how the mechanics of that would work for infrastructure charging, if that is okay.

CHAIR: That is not a problem.

Mr HART: I have a couple of questions arising from your opening statement, David. With regard to the bridge across the river, is it correct that the legislation will allow for other examples of this piece of infrastructure starting in a PDA and ending up being facilitated somewhere else or is it just for this bridge?

Mr Edwards: It is specifically for this bridge in the act, but the amendments to the Economic Development Act do potentially allow it to be applied to other areas in this state.

Mr HART: Would you be able to give us an example of why we would do that and not just do it for this particular development?

Mr Edwards: I will give you an example which gives relevance to the issue we are trying to resolve. The PDA area has been declared on the precinct. The bridge lands in South Bank Corporation's area. Essentially, we could have up to three approving authorities for that project. To make it a simple approving authority on this basis, because the Deputy Premier, as the Minister for Economic Development Queensland, is the planning authority for the precinct, it made sense to clarify that and have one planning authority for the infrastructure that is directly associated with the development. That is specifically for this example. There is the infrastructure that flows from this site but yet is a critical part of the site as well.

Mr HART: I understand for this particular site, but why are we allowing that example to flow across the whole state? Are there any particular examples you can provide?

Mr Leach: I can speak to that. At the moment there are 26 priority development areas across the state. We are talking about specific development that is associated with those PDAs. We are not talking about new areas; we are talking about specific pieces of infrastructure where multiple jurisdictions are involved in the approval and conditioning process. For example, with the bridge, you could have a bridge or another piece of infrastructure—a water main, for example—out of another PDA. If you have two approval authorities, they might impose different conditions on that infrastructure which could cause complications down the track. Different powers of entry and all the other powers that are associated with the MEDQ under the Economic Development Act then apply to that piece of infrastructure as well. It is to streamline the process and make it simpler for both the applicant and for the authority.

Mr HART: I guess that goes to the chair's question before about whether a council can charge infrastructure charges for something. If the minister can overrule a council's decision on something, how does a council then look at charging infrastructure charges for that pipeline you just talked about?

Mr Leach: We will take that question on notice and come back to the committee.

Mr HART: Has any concern been raised by anybody in your consultation about opening this particular thing up to the whole state and not limiting it to this particular development?

Mr Edwards: I can only talk about this particular development. It is seen by all parties involved as a pragmatic and practical way to provide certainty and to avoid some issues down the track in terms of differing approval authorities. This one we see is supported by all stakeholders involved.

Mr HART: How much consultation has there been on this bill?

Mr Edwards: For this bill, there has been significant consultation. We have had various working parties set up with Brisbane City Council and the various government departments involved such as the Department of Transport and Main Roads, Natural Resources and Mines in terms of tenure issues and South Bank Corporation. There has been extensive consultation throughout the process. We are satisfied that the vast majority of parties are very satisfied with the bill and its provisions. We have taken into account the concerns of the Royal Historical Society, the Heritage Council and those sorts of aspects.

Mr HART: The explanatory notes tell us that an exposure draft of the bill was provided to DBC for comment in late November.

Mr Edwards: Yes.

Mr HART: Were any other stakeholders given the draft exposure bill?

Ms Jorgensen: No, only Destination Brisbane Consortium because it is a signatory to the casino agreement.

Mr HART: With the casino agreement, is there such a thing as a standard casino agreement or is this completely new, out-of-the-box negotiated?

Mr Ford: Mr Hart, the answer is yes and no, as always in these things. As you know, there are four casinos in Queensland each of which has its own casino agreement. The first of those goes back to the early eighties, so there has been a natural evolution in the development of the content of those casino agreements, although I would have to say the first four were relatively similar. There are some differences in terms of what they cover, but they are relatively similar documents. This one is a bit different for a couple of reasons. Part of the reason for the difference is the scale of the entity. This is a much bigger entity than previous ones.

The second one, and probably more germane, is that the ownership structure of Destination Brisbane Consortium is much more complex than any of the ownership structures we have had to deal with in the past involving onshore and offshore companies, public companies, private companies, public companies listed in Australia, public companies listed in Hong Kong and private companies that are unlisted in Hong Kong. There have been a number of changes in the casino agreement form, but, if you were to look at the four we have done so far and this one, you would see some strong commonalities between them.

Mr HART: When was this one entered into or negotiated?

Mr Ford: This one was negotiated through the discussion process with Destination Brisbane Consortium. It has been an ongoing exercise virtually throughout the whole process.

Mr HART: So it was only finalised when the bill was tabled?

Mr Ford: It is now awaiting the last signatures. It has been finalised; we just need to get everybody to sign.

Mr HART: Is this pretty much the final—

Mr Ford: It is pretty much the final, yes.

Mr HART: If there are changes, how much notification will the parliament get of the changes before we need to vote on this?

Mr Ford: My understanding is that the Attorney is hoping to be able to table the final bill at the time of the debate, if not before, and to point out any changes there are at that time.

Mr HART: It would be good to get it earlier than in the House on the day.

Mr Ford: Mr Hart, I must say I would be very surprised if there is anything other than typographical and formatting changes, because the bill that was tabled at the end of last year was very, very close to the final document.

CHAIR: During your consultation process were there any significant issues that kept coming to the surface? If there were, could you tell us about those? How did you manage those issues so that everybody is happy?

Mr Edwards: I can probably talk about the development side of things and perhaps David can talk about any casino licence related issues. We knew with a transformational project like this that consultation and stakeholder engagement was paramount. We have had extensive consultation with all stakeholders. That includes people like the tenants. There is a range of existing tenants on the site, some of whom have been there for quite some time. We have Brisbane's oldest heritage there. It is the original heritage precinct with the Commissariat Store as the first building, the Royal Historical Society's home.

We have had strong support from all those stakeholders. We have been facilitating various tenants to move into other forms of accommodation, and we are working very effectively with those guys. The Royal Historical Society is an example of a group that is very supportive because for too long our heritage assets have been hidden away on the precinct and now they will be able to get good public access. The Royal Historical Society is very, very supportive.

It extends to Indigenous groups, because we are demolishing several buildings there. There is quite a detailed consultation project with Indigenous communities about decommissioning the Neville Bonner Building. We have had consultations with the Police Service. We will be moving the police memorial on George Street. That is not only working with the Police Service but also working with the unions and the families of people who are represented there.

I would consider our consultation process fairly strong. We have had very, very strong support. We have had some comments from the architectural community on design elements of the site, and that is fairly common in these sorts of projects. It is like putting economists in a room: you will get different opinions. It is the same with architects, but overall I would say that the consultation process has been successful and the project is very strongly supported, particularly by the tourism sector, which is very excited about having 1.4 million extra tourists in the town and the prospect of having new five- and six-star hotels being built in Brisbane. We have not had a branded hotel built in Brisbane for close to 20 years, so we have had very strong support.

CHAIR: There were no stand-out issues that you had to put a lot of work into?

Mr Edwards: There are potential stand-out issues. That is why we have been working with them very closely—for example, the tenants.

CHAIR: Can you tell us about them?

Mr Edwards: It is just making sure that tenants who have been in that area for quite some time are catered for, and we are working with them on relocation options. As we said, the Indigenous community is critical in this because of the Neville Bonner Building and some of the public art. The fact there has not been a lot of noise is testament to the department's and other departments' ability to work effectively with these stakeholders.

CHAIR: Are you aware of any broader public concerns with regard to the development?

Mr Edwards: When we did a range of public consultations, we had website feedback. We have had people in the streets talking to people about it. As I said, we have had fairly strong support from people because they believe the precinct needs to be revitalised. It is a pretty dead end of town at the moment. Also, it is delivering such significant public realm. Twelve football fields of public realm

will be available all the time for people. I think people are quite excited about the prospects of what is to come and how it will build the city and transform tourism.

Mrs LAUGA: I have a couple of questions. What will this development mean for Brisbane?

Mr Edwards: I think that the objective the former government and the current government have are identical and that is about transformational development. It is about attracting international tourists to the city. We very much modelled the development on the successful Marina Bay Sands development, Singapore. As a result of changing air routes it suffered a fairly big decline in visitor numbers. People used to stay there for a week when it was a major hub. That dropped down to just over one night. They developed their integrated resort development and that resulted in a massive influx of international tourists again, and staying for multiple nights. Our key objective is to increase tourism into Brisbane and to get people to stay there longer but also to facilitate, as I said before, developments like new conference facilities.

The hotels are critical. The rising demand from Asian tourists is very exciting. We are getting 10 to 14 per cent growth a year. These tourists want branded hotels. They want hotels that they are used to staying in so therefore it is critical we get those established. We would not have been able to facilitate the establishment of those hotels without the catalytic nature of the IRD development in Queen's Wharf. It is about economic development, it is about tourism, it is about delivery of public realm and also it is about a return to the state through the jobs and investment this will bring: up to 3,000 jobs during construction and 8,000 operational jobs. Star has already committed to developing a major training facility to make sure we have skilled workers there. The other aspect of the project which is going to be very beneficial is the supply chain opportunities. The Star people want to source as many products and services they can from Queenslanders. The Department of State Development is very active throughout the state making sure we can supply beef to the project, supply cut flowers to the project and also access skills and other products that Queensland produces.

Mrs LAUGA: On that integrated resort development process, my understanding, and correct me if I am wrong, is that there were three licences available: two for regional Queensland and one in South-East Queensland. My understanding was that in Brisbane that additional licence will not need to be utilised because the casino licence will be an extension of the existing one. Does that then leave an additional licence that is not being utilised?

Mr Edwards: The IRD process is not directly related to this bill but I am happy to answer that. The government's intention was to make up to three licences available, with one of those being quarantined for Queen's Wharf no matter what the outcome was. So if a proponent other than Star won there would have been an additional licence but, as Star has won, that is considered the one IRD licence so there is not an extra one available as a result of Star being successful in the Queen's Wharf Brisbane proposal.

Mr MILLAR: So there is one licence available still?

Mr Edwards: No, all three are committed at the moment, Queen's Wharf with Star. We are in negotiations with Aquis in Cairns and ASF on the Gold Coast.

Mrs LAUGA: In relation to the provisions of the bill to do with the PDA associated development, I noticed that Brisbane City Council in its submission raises serious concerns about what that could mean because it is not just specific to this PDA; it could well be applied to all PDAs across the state. The Local Government Association of Queensland has also raised concerns. How have discussions around that gone with council and the LGAQ to date and is it really necessary for PDA associated development to streamline this process for all PDAs across the state or is it just necessary only with the bridge instance?

Mr Leach: Thanks for the question, Mrs Lauga. We have not seen the Brisbane City Council's submission or the LGAQ's submissions yet. We did meet with the LGAQ and understand their key concerns. I think it makes sense, as I explained before, that there are similar situations that happen across the state for other PDAs, or could happen in the future, and we are trying to future proof that and, instead of making act amendments down the track, provide for that now. I think we can respond that we are talking about specific development; we are not talking about new areas or an extension of the PDA as such. That development is presented to the MEDQ. There is mandatory consultation with the local government prior to declaration of that PDA associated development so any issues that that local government have can be raised at that point. I think in lots of ways it can help streamline the development approval and conditioning process and that would be beneficial for council as well, and we are talking about mitigating the impacts of providing for development in the PDA which could also have beneficial impacts for the local government area.

Mrs LAUGA: For example, the LGAQ in its submission has said that the PDA associated development does not have to be contiguous with the PDA and could include development scenarios that range from a sewage treatment plant outside the PDA, additional stages of residential development to maximise the value of sunk infrastructure, buffer areas or the like. Are they all things that could well be facilitated under the PDA associated development provisions?

Mr Leach: It does not need to be contiguous to the PDA. We gave a lot of thought to whether it should be contiguous, because there may be circumstances where it is not but it is still providing or mitigating the impacts of the development in the PDA. In consideration, in the declaration the MEDQ has a number of criteria that are set out in the act. It talks about mitigating the impacts, providing infrastructure for the PDA, promoting the orderly development and management of the PDA in accordance with the development scheme and avoids compromising the implementation of the existing development scheme for the PDA.

Mrs LAUGA: Do you have any examples of where provisions like this could have come in handy for the EDQ previous to this bill being introduced?

Mr Leach: Yes. For example, there was a development at the Southport PDA that extended past the high watermark—so, the PDA boundary was at the high watermark and it extended into the water. In that circumstance the Gold Coast City Council was the delegate for that PDA, but it could have been a more streamlined process if there were these provisions in the act.

Mrs LAUGA: Is that the only example across the state?

Mr Leach: That is the only example I could give right now. We could take it on notice and give you some further ones if you like.

Mrs LAUGA: That would be very useful, thank you.

CHAIR: Should councils be concerned that this process is too broad?

Mr Leach: I think that councils are involved in the consultation process beforehand so in the minister's—

CHAIR: They seem to be raising it as their main issue.

Mr Leach: Yes. They are consulted prior to declaration. If the development itself is deemed to be assessable development it also requires public notification of that specific development. That is another opportunity for the community and the local government to raise any further concerns with that development. That is after declaration and through the development assessment process. We are talking about discrete development here.

CHAIR: Should they be concerned?

Mr Leach: I don't believe so.

CHAIR: Do you think that there is a need to make that a little bit clearer? It is obviously something that stood out to councils and that is why they have raised it. Do you think we need to be a little bit clearer in explaining it?

Mr Leach: I believe that the criteria provide enough justification; the existing criteria are sufficient but I guess that is something that may come up through the committee process.

CHAIR: Why would you think these councils are all consistent in their views?

Mr HART: You are taking power away from them.

CHAIR: That is what I was trying to get to. Do you feel that way? You are amongst friends.

Mr Leach: It is reflecting what the existing PDA scenario is. There is declaration of PDAs in those areas. It is just allowing for this other development that might be associated with that PDA and streamlining that process.

Mr BUTCHER: In your statement it says you allow casino operators in Queensland to extend credit to non-Queensland resident junket participants. Could you tell me what a 'resident junket participant' is?

Mr Ford: A lot of the high-roller activity, the larger punter activity, that happens in casinos is as a result of what they call junket programs, which is where an individual or a group of individuals come into the casino, deposit money with the casino and bet, sometimes for a short period sometimes for a long period, and there is a rebate system in place where the casino gives them an incentive, if I can put it that way, that can be based on the amount of turnover they have while they are there or it can be based on the amount they lose. These are actually high-risk activities for casinos because these people don't always lose. I know everybody assumes that you always lose money at a casino but

some of these people are very experienced players and they don't always lose. In Queensland the laws about those sorts of commission or junket activities have always been that they have got to be non-Queensland residents to participate. Effectively it is a relaxation of the normal casino rules to allow those sorts of commissions et cetera to be paid. The reason for doing that is to attract people into Queensland. It assists with tourism. It is export dollars, effectively, coming into the state. That has always been the case. Rules about junkets have always applied to non-Queensland residents for that very reason. This is an extension of that to allow for credit facilities to be provided at the operator's discretion to people who are coming in on those commission based play arrangements or junkets.

Mr BUTCHER: Are these things in place in other states of Australia?

Mr Ford: Part of the reason we have gone down this track is that the competitors to our casinos are all doing it now.

Mr BUTCHER: So all of our high rollers are going to New South Wales and Victoria and all theirs want to come to ours?

Mr Ford: That is the risk according to the casino operators, unless they can compete in that same market. Obviously this casino that is going into Queen's Wharf is going to be much more focused on the international market than has been possible with the existing Brisbane casino. So to do that they need to be able to offer products that are competitive with Star in Sydney or with Crown in Melbourne or at Burswood in Perth or, for that matter, with Macau or Singapore which are the competitors in this space.

Mr BUTCHER: Are these in place currently with the casinos that are in Queensland now?

Mr Ford: The junket arrangements are in place, but the credit arrangements are not. The credit arrangements will be new when this legislation goes through.

Mr BUTCHER: Will that then transfer to other casinos or just this one?

Mr Ford: No, these are amendments to the Casino Control Act which will apply to all casinos.

Mr BUTCHER: We are currently looking at the Planning Bill and there is a lot of concern with infrastructure charges. My concern is with this bridge that goes over to South Bank. Are the associated costs of the development covered by the Queen's Wharf project or will it go to the council outside the proposal that you put in?

Mr Leach: Can you clarify is that about the bridge itself?

Mr BUTCHER: The bridge is going to land on the ground over at South Bank and you are going to make it nice over there. If there are any associated infrastructure works that the council then has to do to make that work over on South Bank will that charge go to the council or will that be part of the project costs to make it right?

Mr Edwards: I can probably answer that one. The consortium is responsible for the entire cost.

Mr BUTCHER: So the whole footprint and any associated costs or charges will be borne. Thank you.

Mr MILLAR: I have picked up from regional councils a concern about the associated development provisions. Is that because, one, it is possibly taking away decisions from the local authority area and, two, the ability for them to charge for infrastructure charges? Do you think that would be a main concern for councils outside the Brisbane City Council area?

Mr Leach: I think that certainly the first is correct, that it is about the jurisdictional issue that exists now with PDAs. It is not usual, bearing in mind that there are PDAs throughout the state that have actually been requested by that local government to the state. For example, Southport, Toowoomba, Townsville, have all come to the state and said they want a PDA. There will be some local governments where that may not be the case or some historical PDAs, but, yes, I think you are correct. As I mentioned, we will get back to you on the infrastructure charging issue. Infrastructure charging is very complicated so we will just need to give you some more detail on the mechanics of that.

Mr BUTCHER: Just for my own understanding, you mentioned Toowoomba Regional Council, what did they use a PDA for?

Mr Leach: For the Toowoomba Railway Parklands PDA. It is in the centre of town. They wanted to revitalise the centre of their town and introduce new public realm opportunities and change their development on under-utilised railway land.

Mr MILLAR: So the state government took over the planning process there; is that right?

Mr Leach: That is actually delegated to the local government. So it is declared a PDA. The plan making is with the local government. It gets approved by the minister for Economic Development Queensland. The ultimate development scheme and the declaration itself happens and then the development assessment is undertaken by Toowoomba. Under the act there are opportunities to delegate plan making and development assessment—one or the other.

Mr MILLAR: For a person who is a non-planner and is just trying to get a bit of an understanding from the regional point of view, why PDAs? We had a Coordinator-General. We had processes in place. Is it more streamlined? Is it a better process to go through?

Mr Leach: It has a number of benefits. It coordinates all the state's interests in the plan making process. It is a 12-month process from go to woe, so from declaration to finalisation of the development scheme for that area is done in 12 months. Amendment to a local planning instrument can take up to two years or longer, so it is more streamlined to get economic development and delivery of that development on the ground as soon as possible.

Mr MILLAR: Moving on to casinos, you mentioned before there were three licences issued, but the proponent of the licence here already has a licence and does not need a licence; is that right?

Mr Edwards: Yes. The three licences were made available, and one of those was reserved for the Queens Wharf precinct. Regardless of the outcome, whether Star was the winning proponent—which they were in that case—that would not mean that that additional licence was released. There was always going to be one licence, but it gave the government the ability, if Echo did not win the proposal, to grant that licence to a new operator. But there was no intention at any time if the winning consortium was Echo—or Star in this case—to make that licence available to other projects. That was not the policy intent.

Mr MILLAR: So you have these three licences but you have only issued two licences; is that right?

Mr Edwards: No, Queens Wharf is the first contractually closed project; the other two we are in negotiations with at the moment. We are in detailed negotiations through the IRD process with a proponent in Cairns and a proponent on the Gold Coast.

Mr MILLAR: Once they are approved would you be looking at PDA mechanisms for those?

Mr Leach: It is too early.

Mr Edwards: It is too early. With Cairns, for example, it is private land. The proponent up there has an option on that private land, and he did his EIS through the Coordinator-General and he will be working with the local government. In terms of the Gold Coast, it is too early and we have not yet worked out what the planning regime will be there.

Mr MILLAR: It is a learning process for me.

Mr HART: In the IRD process maybe it is better to say there were two licences available outside Brisbane.

Mr Edwards: That is probably a neater way to describe it: two licences available outside of Brisbane.

Mr HART: Can I just ask a question about the lockout provisions that are contained in this bill which exempt this development. I presume that is aimed at lockout provisions that possibly will come to the parliament today, or existing—

Mr Ford: As you know, Mr Hart, we have had lockout conditions for more than 10 years, and it has always been the practice that those lockouts have not applied to casinos anywhere at any time. So this is just continuing that practice, whatever the outcome of the next couple of days will be.

Mr HART: Can you explain the rationale behind casinos being exempt from lockouts?

Mr Ford: It starts with the philosophical differences between the purposes of the premises. With a hotel particularly the purpose is to go there for the consumption of alcohol and meals on-site. For clubs the purposes are a little bit broader than that, but for casinos they are quite different. The purpose of going to a casino is because it is a gambling destination, and that is primarily what it is there for. Casinos operate in an international space. They operate in a very different regulatory regime from clubs and pubs. They have their own discrete piece of legislation. They have very significant requirements on them in terms of security provision, in terms of entrance standards, in terms of closed-circuit television. For those that are open 24 hours, seven days, they have permanent surveillance teams watching everything that is happening in and around the casino precinct, and that is common with every other casino that they are competing with around the country. So they are in a

very different space to clubs and pubs. In fact, what these provisions do is nothing more than has been the case since lockouts first came in in 2003, I think it was, or 2004, so there is nothing new in it. There is every expectation that casinos are more able to manage their circumstances than pubs and clubs are. They are looking to a different market and they are competing with other casinos rather than necessarily with other domestic pub and club environments.

Mr HART: This integrated resort is a bit different to just a casino though, is it not? It is a massive project with lots of buildings. I would imagine that the provisions of the lockout laws do not just apply to the casino floor itself; they apply to the whole development.

Mr Ford: There is actually a middle tier, if I can put it that way. There is the whole precinct which is being developed under a range of different scenarios for a range of different purposes, and the lockout laws will apply probably to the vast bulk of that project geographically. There is a defined space where the casino and its ancillary facilities are, which I suppose conceptually is the same as you have with the Brisbane casino or with Jupiters down the coast where you have a casino floor, you have a range of entertainment and dining facilities around that and you have a hotel facility associated with that. We have not seen the final plans yet because this is not opening until 2022, but probably that will be larger in Brisbane than it is in the current Brisbane casino and probably larger than it is at Jupiters; although Jupiters, as you know, is undergoing some significant expansion now. But to say that the whole precinct will be free of a lockout is not true. We will issue a special facilities licence for a space within the precinct which will cover the casino and the adjacent and relevant facilities, and they will be subject to exactly the same freedom from lockout as the current casino and its adjacent facilities are. But the exact scope of that I cannot tell you today because as commissioner I still have not seen the licence application.

Mr HART: Will that be covered by a regulation?

Mr Ford: That will be a decision of the commissioner at the end of the day. There is a footprint which is set out in the agreement which defines the outer space within which the commissioner can make that decision, but the commissioner will then make the decision within that space as to what are related facilities to the casino that it is appropriate to extend that lockout to. And the 24-hour trading, I should add, because it is not just the lockout. Casinos traditionally have had 24-hour trading, whereas other pubs and clubs have not had that.

Mr HART: That is located on some sort of map. Where is that defined?

Mr Ford: My recollection is that it is an attachment to the agreement.

Mr HART: So it is in the bill?

Mr Ford: Yes.

Mr HART: Why is the casino agreement in the bill? Because it is going to need to be amended from time to time, so are we going to be coming back and changing this bill all the time?

Mr Ford: The casino agreement is in the bill because it is required to have the force of law to give us the powers that we need, particularly in the probity space, to do the work we need to do to enforce the provisions that they have agreed to. So yes, it does need to be in the bill, and the probability is that from time to time we will amend it. There are some parts of the agreement particularly that relate to geographical spaces and floor plans and things like that which do not need to come back to parliament to be amended, but any substantial matters we would expect to bring back to the parliament.

CHAIR: I refer to Brisbane City Council's submission. They have stated—

Council is seriously concerned about the proposal to expand the planning authority of the Minister for Economic Development Queensland through the declaration of Priority Development Area-associated development for areas outside a normal PDA.

Why would they be so concerned about that?

Mr Leach: I guess, as we mentioned before, it is a jurisdictional issue that is always going to exist between the state and local government as far as planning. There are other mechanisms like the Coordinator-General state development areas that have existed for some time, and PDAs have existed since the Urban Land Development Authority, which was under the former Labor government, and then the previous LNP brought in the Economic Development Act. I think with some councils—I would not say it is every council across Queensland because we cannot be that broad—there have been issues from the outset. I think it is just reiterating those same issues. I do not think it is news to anyone, frankly.

CHAIR: Also in their submission the council draws to the committee's attention the importance of the Queensland government continuing to liaise with council about the development of the QWB and the establishment of by-laws for future governance of the precinct.

Council recommends that clear roles and responsibilities are outlined for Council and EDQ.

Mr Leach: Under the ED act the existing council by-laws have effect in all PDAs. There is an opportunity for the MEDQ to enact a specific local law for that PDA, and there is one that exists for vegetation management. That is the only one that exists under the ED act currently. So in my mind, it is very clear that the existing local laws apply as far as we are concerned.

CHAIR: That is fair comment. What can be done to make sure council takes a good look at those laws before they start getting concerned about it?

Mr Leach: I guess if they have any specific concerns about specific local laws that are in play at the moment, they can approach the state and ask them about the effect of those and whether there needs to be any changes to it, and that would be up to the MEDQ to consider if there was a requirement.

CHAIR: As a country member, I run into a lot of local governments that have problems with the way it is all written. Things are not explained enough. They are just ordinary country people. I find one of the biggest issues that government has is that they are not explaining things to people enough in simple terms. Do you think it is worth giving some consideration to try and do that? Maybe not in the legislation, but in some sort of attachment.

Mr Leach: To outline the local laws or to outline—

CHAIR: To make it clearer what you are actually saying.

Mr Leach: And whose responsibility it is for development assessment—

CHAIR: How you go about sorting that out.

Mr Leach: Yes, that is a reasonable comment and something we could do outside of legislation.

Mr Edwards: Broadly with Queens Wharf we have a good close working relationship with the Brisbane City Council. During the assessment process they were involved as a key stakeholder as part of that assessment. We are working with them on the traffic management plan at the moment and on riverside infrastructure; for example, the finger wharves down in front of the area where the Brisbane River cruise industry is. So there are mechanisms that have been built into the transaction phase, but more importantly as we move through to the contract administration phase Brisbane City Council will be intermittently involved in the contract administration.

Mr Leach: Can I also add to that, David, that through the development assessment process as well council will be involved and they will be advised of any development applications that are being lodged in the PDA and will have an opportunity to provide comment. It is not a legislative requirement, but given the location of this PDA and the integration and connectivity issues with the broader CBD, it is imperative that they understand the issues being raised through the DA process.

Mr HART: You can probably see, Tom, that every member of the committee here has asked the same question in a slightly different way, so we are all concerned about this particular issue. Just expanding on that a little bit, how far away from a PDA could a PDA associated development take place? I am from the Gold Coast, so if the casino here needed desalinated water, for instance, could that extend to the desalination plant on the Gold Coast?

Mr Leach: The legislation does not provide a scale or a distance or anything, because I guess you could come across a circumstance where you are 500 metres away from the PDA associated development. But I draw your attention to the criteria that are in the bill, and they are very clear that it has to mitigate the impacts of development in the PDA or its infrastructure for that PDA, and there has to be some sense of logic in that decision-making process.

Mr HART: It is up to the minister.

Mr Leach: It is up to the minister; that is correct.

Mr HART: So it could be anything.

Mr Leach: Again, I think the criteria are there, Mr Hart, and the minister has the discretion to make a decision under those criteria.

CHAIR: It raises the concern that we have about making things clear for people, so that they understand. Jane, if you do not mind me asking, can you tell us what your job is?

Ms Griffiths: I have come in a little later in the piece to assist with developing the legislation. Tom went away on holidays and I was able to continue working with Parliamentary Counsel on developing the legislation and that sort of thing. And writing explanatory material for in-house and that sort of thing, as well. We are Economic Development Queensland.

Mr Leach: We work together.

CHAIR: Have you come across any issues in your work so far that stand out as needing to be addressed or do you just handle it within your special area?

Ms Griffiths: I think we have addressed the issues as they have arisen. We are working on those criteria that went into the act to guide MEDQ's decision on PDA associated development.

CHAIR: Are there any other questions?

Mr BUTCHER: What measures are in place to protect the mangroves and other aspects of the environment within this new precinct?

Mr Leach: I can speak to that. I mentioned briefly before, Mr Butcher, about the process of managing state interests upfront in the plan making process. One of the key state interests is environment and biodiversity. That is under the state planning policy. That is considered through that plan making process. Within the Queen's Wharf PDA, the mangroves are listed as a matter of state environmental significance. We have reflected that in the development scheme for Queen's Wharf Brisbane. Through the development assessment process, that is a consideration.

Mr BUTCHER: And the same goes for the way that the precinct operates environmentally, with potential solar and all that sort of thing? Does that come into the project or is it separate?

Mr Leach: It is a consideration. As part of the development scheme for Queen's Wharf, there are three components: there is a land use plan, an infrastructure plan and an implementation strategy. In the implementation strategy, it does have an environmental sustainability section that discusses innovation opportunities to be considered through the process.

Mr MILLAR: Going onto the issue with the existing buildings and the accommodation requirements for people, what process do you have in place now? I know it is not until 2022, but obviously before construction starts you will have to start. Is there office space and accommodation available?

Mr Edwards: There is a range of different parties there now with different circumstances. Broadly, where we can assist with relocation, we will. That is relocation costs and things such as that. Where we can facilitate their movement to another area that is appropriate, we are doing that as well. It has been a two and a half to three year process, Mr Millar. We have been working with all the guys there for quite some time. So far, we are having very positive discussions with the majority of the tenants there, to cater for their needs.

Mr MILLAR: Have you identified office space already?

Mr Edwards: For every tenant there is a different solution. Some of these organisations are very active; some of them are not very active at all. That is what has come into play when we have determined what sort of office space we could make available for them. We have tried to make sure that we are overgenerous with relocation costs and also, where we can facilitate new office space that will suit their needs, we are indeed doing that.

Mr HART: Who is meeting the costs?

Mr Edwards: The project will bear that cost.

Mr Ford: It is a very direct issue for a number of us who actually are located in that space.

Mr MILLAR: Yes, you will need to find a home.

Mr Ford: Indeed. This year we will need to find a home, yes.

Mrs LAUGA: I have two quick questions. Why did you choose to go down the PDA path as opposed to a coordinated project path?

Mr Edwards: There are a variety of state-led planning processes that could be applied. In this instance, a PDA was appropriate for development there. There was no need to prepare an environmental impact statement, for example, which is required under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act. It allowed us to involve Brisbane City Council in the process in a far more flexible way than a state development area or a coordinated project under the act would provide. For this purpose, the PDA is the way to go. Also, for a major investment of \$3 billion-plus, there is an expectation from investors that there is a state-led planning process, and that happens in the resource sector all the time and in other projects as well. That justifies the level of investment that the investor can expect the state to take a lead and coordinate the process.

Mrs LAUGA: Around connectivity, the major public transport hubs in the Brisbane CBD are not near the project area. I appreciate the bridge will help improve pedestrian connectivity between South Bank and the CBD. What other elements of the development will incorporate public transport use and encourage public transport use to access the site?

Mr Edwards: We are working very closely with TransLink and the Brisbane City Council on the impacts of this development in the construction phase, because there will be some disruptions during construction; there will be streets closed and bus stops shifted, so we have to address that immediate impact so that people know what is happening and know how it will impact on them. There will also be some limited shutdowns when there is work required over the freeway, obviously, during demolition. Again, we are working very closely with DTMR, so that we can make sure we minimise any impacts on drivers for that.

More importantly, this project does give us the opportunity to really look at how public transport is coordinated in that whole precinct, whether it be the ferry service, buses or future public transport projects as well. The project has always been designed with the ability that if a major public transport link, for example a BaT tunnel or a Cross River Rail tunnel, was built, there would be connectivity into the precinct. That has been a requirement.

Mrs LAUGA: As it stands, the developer has no requirement to incorporate any new major public transport hubs?

Mr Edwards: They have a requirement to make sure they can incorporate that requirement. Obviously within their design, they would be making sure that if a station was built in the precinct there would be connectivity directly into the precinct, because that makes sense for them as well.

Mr HART: Originally, the BaT tunnel would have been built into this process, but it has been axed.

Mr Edwards: It had a George Street alignment and at that stage the proposal was for the station to be located where 63 George Street is. Again the proponent has designed the project so that, wherever those stations are located, there can be connectivity.

Mr HART: Has the axing of the BaT tunnel had an adverse effect on public transport to this particular facility?

Mr Edwards: That is not really in my jurisdiction to answer, Mr Hart.

Mr HART: It is a shame you won't!

Mr BUTCHER: My next question sits around heritage protection. We have seen in Brisbane over the past month or so the dramas that have happened with the potential knockdown of an old house. I want to know what the impacts are and how the project will get around heritage protection, particularly with the old buildings and the old bits and pieces around the place? What is the overall scope of how we are going to deal with heritage protection to make sure it stays how it is?

Mr Edwards: I think that is one of the real positives of the project. All of the heritage assets that are in that precinct will be protected. More importantly, they will be enhanced. I have had the opportunity to walk through Harris Terrace and all those buildings. They are in desperate need of being renovated and restored to their former glory. The Star Entertainment Group is committed to doing that. They have had a successful track record of doing that within the two heritage buildings they own now. The good news, Mr Butcher, is that not only will there be investment, but also they will be brought back to their former glory and the public will get to use them, which they do not do at the moment. That is a positive story.

Mr BUTCHER: Obviously with large buildings being demolished right beside some of them, that will be taken into—

Mr Edwards: Yes. In fact, we did some core drilling in Miller Park this week and the people from the Royal Historical Society were there onsite with us. They were very interested in the type of drilling rig we were using, just to ensure that their assets were protected.

Mr Leach: I can add, Mr Butcher, that through the PDA process, as well as the contractual arrangements that DSD has with the proponent, the development scheme for the Queen's Wharf PDA includes strong provisions for protection of heritage and maintenance of all heritage buildings on the site.

Mr BUTCHER: So it is ongoing, forever?

Mr Edwards: Yes.

CHAIR: We will probably make this the last question. Have you read the submissions from the Heart Foundation?

Mr Edwards: We have not seen them.

CHAIR: Sorry, we have not put them up yet. I think this question impacts on most of us. I just hope I am here in 2022, when it is opened. If any of you guys are here, will you make sure I get an invitation? The Heart Foundation, in its submission, calls for an amendment to the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill 2015 to reflect the link between the precinct and health and wellbeing, and to provide the necessary legislative framework to ensure that health and wellbeing considerations can be successfully and systematically incorporated in Queen's Wharf Brisbane. What sort of assurance can you give the committee with regard to what the Heart Foundation is calling for? Is that addressed?

Mr Leach: If you do not mind me speaking, David, I think that that is probably not a legislation issue. It is certainly a planning issue and something that we considered through the drafting of the development scheme for the PDA. That is about providing walkability, pedestrian accessibility and maintenance of the bicentennial bikeway to provide cycling amenity to the precinct. I think they are all considerations. In my mind, it is not really the place of legislation to enforce that type of provision.

CHAIR: That is fair enough. Given it is the Heart Foundation and we are all getting on in life, I thought it would be a good question.

Mr Edwards: There will be plenty of places for you to jog around the precinct.

Mr MILLAR: Going back to my last question about accommodation and getting ready for that, obviously you would be trying to keep most of the Public Service in George Street close by, so 1 William Street would probably cater for a lot of that; is that right?

Mr Ford: Yes. My understanding is that 1 William Street will cater for the bulk of the public servants who are coming out of that space and some public servants who are coming out of other parts of George Street, as well. As you will appreciate, it is a very large building. It will not cater for everybody in that space and I am one of those for whom it will not cater. We will have to find alternative accommodation. This whole thing is like a large jigsaw puzzle: there are pieces moving in every direction. 1 William Street is triggering a whole pile of other Public Service shifts around the place. I do not think there is any issue with us finding appropriate accommodation. It is just that the Department of Housing and Public Works has a fairly large job to do to make sure that everybody is satisfactorily accommodated at the end of the day. Yes, obviously, George Street is still the Public Service area.

Mr MILLAR: And 1 William Street will be the home?

Mr Ford: And 1 William Street will be the home for a lot of the people who will come out of that space.

CHAIR: I can see myself sitting on a chair down there, watching people enjoying themselves and saying, 'I had a bit to do with that. I was there when this thing first started!' But I am not here to be a comedian. There being no further questions, I will close the meeting. I think you took two questions on notice, so could we have those by Wednesday of next week, 4 February. Thank you. I thank you all for your attendance at today's briefing. It has been very interested. I am quite excited, because I think this is a great thing for Brisbane. It is what we need. We need new and exciting things to be happening, so that we can draw people into the city, because it is the best city in Australia, although other people will say that Keppel might be. Thank you very much for being here. I appreciate your frankness and the way that you have gone about responding to the questions. I dare say that we will talk again, as we go along this process. Thank you very much and congratulations on the good work that you are doing.

Mr Ford: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIR: I declare the hearing closed.

Committee adjourned at 10.15 am