



Speech By  
**Brittany Lauga**

**MEMBER FOR KEPPEL**

---

Record of Proceedings, 16 August 2016

**MOTION: DEPUTY PREMIER, BUSINESS CONFIDENCE**

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (6.16 pm): The member for Mansfield claims there are no planning grounds for the calling in of this development, but I have read the grounds for calling in and I can tell the member for Mansfield that there are very good planning grounds for the calling in of this development, and experienced planners from across the state would agree. I think it is very important to understand the legislative framework we are operating within here. The call-in power is a reserve power that is limited to matters of state interest as defined by the Sustainable Planning Act 2009. The Deputy Premier has only called in two applications to date, with this being her third consideration of a potential application. In contrast, the member for Callide called in eight applications during his time as planning minister and the sky did not fall as a result of these call-ins.

As a planner I am lucky to know the planning system actually works. In this context I want to make it clear that it is by no means unusual for the call-in power to be contemplated in relation to proposals of this nature. In particular, let us not forget that the member for Callide called in the Jewel development on the Gold Coast. If we compare West Village to Jewel we can see many similarities: both are mixed-use developments which have been approved by the council and subject to a submitter appeal in the courts. Jewel was a \$1 billion project with around 3,000 associated jobs which was removed by the courts to undergo the call-in process. It was ultimately approved, resulting in greater certainty for the project. Those opposite also suggest that the call-in consideration is delaying the project. Again this is not true. The project already has full stage 1 development approval for two residential towers unaffected by the proposed call-in notice, and this can be built whenever the developers want to proceed.

It is surprising that the Leader of the Opposition, who has such a keen interest in planning, does not understand the basics of the development approval process. I do not know any developer who would be brave enough to bring all seven towers with 1,350 units to the market at once. If the LNP do not understand the basic economics of a single development project, how can they be trusted to run the state's economy?

There is also a need to correct the Leader of the Opposition's comments earlier today when he said that the Deputy Premier had stated that there was no state interest in the development. For the benefit of those opposite I want to clarify that the Deputy Premier's earlier comments were in relation to the stage 1 application. The Deputy Premier did not call in the stage 1 application, despite being requested to do so. This was because it was a code assessable application that generally complied with the council's planning scheme.

Let us be clear: this is very different from the preliminary approval that is being considered for a potential call-in and which applies to the entire 2.6-hectare site, is of a significant scale and has areas of departure from the planning scheme. As a planner, it is clear to me that the Deputy Premier's decisions relating to call-ins have been based on planning merit and not on political motivations, as

those opposite are trying to portray. If you take Cedar Woods as an example, I know that some members of the community in Upper Kedron did not want this development to go ahead at all. The Deputy Premier, in her decision to approve in part that development, ensured that it was based on sound planning grounds and in accordance with the LNP's very own plan.

Finally, I remind those opposite that this government has proven its commitment to an efficient planning system for Queensland. This is evidenced by the Deputy Premier's leadership in the delivery of the new Planning Act, which takes effect mid next year and will streamline approval processes and provide greater certainty for industry. I do not support the motion.