



Speech by
**Mr DENVER
BEANLAND**

MEMBER FOR INDOOROOPILLY

Hansard 9 June 1999

BRISBANE TOWN PLAN

Mr BEANLAND (Indooroopilly—LP) (11.18 p.m.): On two previous occasions I have spoken in this Chamber about aspects of the Brisbane town plan. Tonight I wish to address my remarks to another aspect of the plan that I have not yet addressed. In particular, I am concerned about home occupations or businesses.

Currently, under the town plan home occupations are permitted where only the resident of the home is working or running a business from home. This means that there are very clear restrictions on the way in which home businesses can be run. For example, they cannot employ anyone and the resident must operate from home by themselves solely.

Furthermore, the applicant must advertise the details of the purpose for which he or she proposes to use the property and all details have to be spelt out in the application and in the signs put on the property. Local residents then have an opportunity to object and, if they are unhappy with the council's decision, then appeal to the Planning and Environment Court against the decision of the council. Therefore, they have full rights under the current town plan. A particularly important right is that of appeal.

Under the proposed new town plan, applicants—that is residents—of home businesses, as they will become known, will be able to employ up to two people in addition to themselves. Cars are going to be allowed to park on the streets and people will be able to use up to 100 square metres of house space for the purpose of a business. This will allow a massive expansion of businesses into residential areas, bringing with it major changes to the character, aesthetics and environment of the neighbourhood. People will find in many streets that vehicles will be parking at the kerb side; they will be taking up all the space that has previously been used by visitors to local residents or the residents themselves. But employees of businesses in the streets will be taking up that parking space. Of course, that is not to mention the customers of these businesses, who will occupy a large number of spaces, even though as I understand it in some cases only one delivery vehicle per week will be allowed. That is a joke, of course. It will be a farce. That particular rule will not be able to be enforced because, after all, who is going to enforce it?

Furthermore, I understand that, where the resident employs only one person and does not use more than 50 square metres of floor area of their house or dwelling place, they will be able to do that without the local residents having the opportunity to object and appeal. I understand that they will be able to put in a protest, but there will be no right of appeal. Of course, without the right of appeal, the right of protest is worthless. This means that no signs indicating that there is an ability to appeal will be put up. In addition, there will be additional noise coming from these places.

Where residents have only themselves as employees—they cannot employ other people—that places an obvious restrictions on the types of businesses that can operate from dwelling places. It does not matter whether those homes are in my electorate or across the way at Algester, over at Aspley, down at Carindale or wherever it may be, because residential A streets, as they are currently known, with low density housing are going to be affected by this type of development that is going to occur. We are going to find that house after house in street after street in a number of these neighbourhoods will be turned into business establishments.

The second area I just want to touch on briefly is that of security gates. I understand that these are going to be banned from retirement villages and townhouse complexes. This proposal will mean that many of those who live there—especially the elderly—are going to be fearful of their lives; they are going to feel insecure; they are going to feel that they are to be left at the mercy of thugs and burglars. I do not know why one would come up with this proposal, because for good reason most of these establishments currently have security gates. If they are going to be banned on future developments, at the end of the day it will mean that many private dwellings will be without security gates and, of course, those living there will pay some sort of a price for that. I am sure that they are going to be quite alarmed when they find out that in future security gates cannot be erected in townhouse complexes and retirement villages.

Time expired.
