




Speech By
Christopher Whiting

MEMBER FOR BANCROFT

Record of Proceedings, 13 November 2018

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (OXLEY AND YERONGA PDAS) AMENDMENT
REGULATION**

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (6.00 pm): I rise to speak against this disallowance motion. It is a wonderful day when we can stand here in parliament and be lectured by former ministers in the Newman government on how to conduct a consultation process! It will be a poor day when we take advice from ex-Newman government ministers on how to run a nice consultation with the community.

Mr Dick: He wanted to close a school in his own electorate, Everton Park State High School.

Mr WHITING: I take that interjection; he wanted to close the school.

I acknowledge the hard work of the member for Mount Ommaney on the Oxley PDA. It is very clear that she knows this subject. She has the best track record on it. She has asked questions about it in estimates and during question time she has asked questions of the Minister for State Development about it, unlike the LNP. I think we have seen tonight that the LNP are opportunistic and irregular in their protest on this matter. I think they are showing that they have no real understanding of PDAs and what they actually do. They show they have limited knowledge and very little empathy for the real needs of the community. The member for Mount Ommaney does have that empathy, and that knowledge and I advise them to take her lead and listen to her. The member for Glass House has been seemingly running this motion as an attack on the member for Mount Ommaney, and I think that is regrettable to see.

Like the member for Mount Ommaney, I support the interim land use plan for the Oxley priority development area. The Oxley PDA will provide a diverse range of housing to cater for the changing needs of the Oxley community, and that includes affordable, accessible housing, ageing in place and intergenerational living opportunities. I know the area. I lived in Jindalee for a while. I spent a lot of time in Oxley and going through the Oxley station as well. My mother appears regularly at the Oxley senior citizens centre and members of my family live in the area. My niece goes to Corinda State High School as well. I know this area. It needs this kind of redevelopment. This area was developed in one big hit between 40 and 60 years ago. There is not that diversity of housing. The housing stock is pretty similar in each street. We know that the residents need different styles of housing to cater for their needs. They need the housing that allows them to age in place. This site really offers the local community a great opportunity to do exactly that.

This is for those residents who have lived all their life in this community. They do not want to leave. It is a real wrench for them when they get to the age when they feel they have to move. What is wrong with helping older Queenslanders stay in the community that they love? What is proposed with the Oxley PDA is a master planned community with around 75 residential lots and an aged care retirement facility as well. This development is going to support the government's housing strategy, and that is new stock, new choices and a new lease of life for members in the community and families in the community as well.

One of the big winners of the interim land use plan will be the parents and families who use the C&K childcare facility on the existing site. As part of the redevelopment of this site, C&K Yuingi Child Care will move to another location within the precinct, out of the flood zone. That is a great outcome for this particular development. In moving this disallowance motion, the opposition are saying no to that move; they want to keep this childcare centre in the flood zone. We heard great outrage today from the leaders opposite about how they want to protect children, but here is a motion that would prevent the relocation of a childcare centre out of a flood zone in South-East Queensland and they are saying no.

I also note that the buildings on the site at Oxley have been abandoned, they are subject to vandalism and they are imposing a great cost on us, the Queensland taxpayers. I refer to an article from January 2018 which talks about a fire on the site and the ensuing concern about asbestos. I will table that article.

Tabled paper: Media article, dated 7 January 2018, titled 'Asbestos risk after abandoned school fire in Oxley in Brisbane's south' [1878](#).

It is very clear from reading this article that in moving this disallowance motion the opposition is saying yes to vandalism; it is saying yes to those continued risks that this place poses for adjoining residents. I ask: why do the LNP want to keep these buildings in the same place? Why do they want to not do anything with this site except to let the buildings stay there and fester? The local community do not want this site left abandoned. They feel they have been forgotten under what the LNP are proposing. It is very clear that the LNP are not speaking for the community; they are speaking for political benefit, their own assumed political benefit.

It is very clear that the Oxley community wants the revitalisation that this PDA will bring to the community. The PDA will help transform this disused area into a livable, connected and environmentally responsive community. Once again, through this motion, the LNP are saying no to that. We want the LNP to listen to what will be achieved for the community through this PDA. They clearly have no real knowledge about what is going on locally. Let me point out that the current sports fields will be retained; the identified landslip-prone areas throughout the site will be stabilised and remediated as part of the site's rejuvenation; and the interim land use plan will lead to the preservation of significant bushland vegetation. That is along with community gardens, sporting fields and a community centre. Once again, this disallowance motion says no to all of these things that will help revitalise this community.

The redevelopment will see 60 per cent of this site dedicated to public open space, recreation and environmental protection, roads and community use. That is 60 per cent. Twenty per cent will be used for private open space and only 20 per cent of the site will be covered with buildings. I ask the member for Glass House: does that seem intense to him? I ask the member for Everton: does that seem intense to him, especially when we heard from the member for Mount Ommaney that the Brisbane City Council had approved a site close to this one with 170 small dwellings? That does sound intense. Not only will this site be revitalised; it will be transformed and led by community consultation. I think the member for Mount Ommaney has spoken very well about the community consultation that has already occurred. We can see very clearly from this motion that the LNP do not like, nor do they understand, a true community led consultation. They have shown once again their true colours. They would like to impose their will, once again, and the only opinion that matters here is theirs.

Let's not forget these further facts about the PDA proposal. There will be a maximum of three proponents. Registration of interest to deliver a retirement village was released on 17 September and closed on 8 November, and it is expected that a development partner will be selected by about mid-2019. EDQ will soon commence a drafting of the proposed development scheme for the PDA, and it is targeting public notification in early 2019 with adoption of the final development scheme by 2019. The local community in this process will have the chance to continue to shape the development onsite as the development scheme is prepared. The community consultation will keep going to allow people to have a further say. I pay tribute to the minister for economic development for getting on with this exciting proposal and getting on with the job.

What is the LNP policy on PDAs? Except for tonight, we have not heard them talk about PDAs in the parliament. There was hardly any mention in estimates. There have been virtually no motions in our committee. They have no track record on PDAs. They are a bit confused.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr WHITING: I hear the member for Southport talking about this. I point out that earlier today the member for Southport said that the PDA in Southport revitalised Southport. This is what it can do. Once again, we do not know the true feeling of the LNP regarding PDAs.

The sad truth is that this motion is purely political posturing. Let me explain to the LNP that PDAs are a great planning tool which are often implemented by the state in partnership with councils. Of the 14 priority development areas that have been declared since the act was passed, nine have been at

the request of, or in close cooperation with, local governments. Councils love PDAs. When they have huge, complex applications in front of them that touch on different aspects of development, councils come to us and say, 'We need this PDA. We need your help.' We need the great outcomes that are brought to the fore by PDAs in Queensland.

Mr Harper interjected.

Mr WHITING: I take that interjection. That is another example of a great outcome delivered by a PDA here in Queensland. The LNP does not understand PDAs. They do not care what the community needs, and they are using this for political gain—

(Time expired)