




Speech By
Joan Pease

MEMBER FOR LYTTON

Record of Proceedings, 25 June 2025

PLANNING (SOCIAL IMPACT AND COMMUNITY BENEFIT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (8.23 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. I do so as a proud member of the Queensland Labor opposition, a party that supports smart planning, clean energy and a games legacy that delivers for all Queenslanders. What we have before us today is a bill that does none of those things well. It is a bill born not of thoughtful consultation or strategic reform but of political convenience, rushed drafting and a complete disregard for transparency and good governance.

The opposition supports better community engagement and benefit sharing in planning, especially for large-scale projects. We also support renewable energy jobs and we strongly support the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, but this bill is not reform; it is regulation by ambush. That is why I support a move to split the bills to deal with renewables in one bill and the Olympics element in another, with the remaining Economic Development Queensland amendments going into one of those two split bills.

Let me start with the so-called social impact assessment and the community benefit agreement framework. In principle it is a worthy idea, but in practice the Crisafulli LNP government has created an unworkable mess. This bill forces renewable energy proponents to complete extensive social assessments and negotiate binding community agreements before even lodging a development application, before a single drawing is submitted, before stakeholders even know what is being built. I do not know about anyone else here, but I do not think that is sensible policy. It will result in delays, uncertainty, potential cost blowouts and a threat to Queensland's clean energy future.

The LNP has a weird obsession with renewables. There is an antirenewable sentiment running through their veins—like the antirenewable member for Mirani, who I understand from media reports commandeered a committee flight just to complain about his personal circumstances. Many local councils, particularly in our region, have made it clear that they are not resourced for what this bill is proposing. They do not have the staff, the skills or the budget. Councils like Banana shire and Townsville have told the committee in no uncertain terms that they simply cannot shoulder the burden the LNP is dumping on them.

Developers like Acciona, Arc Energy and the Queensland Renewable Energy Council are equally alarmed. They have warned that the bill's pre-lodgement requirements are unworkable. It is unprecedented and it risks killing projects already years in the making. One developer explained it best. When they first scoped a wind project they expected 12 full-time jobs, and in reality it turned out to be 40. You cannot capture that benefit before the details are known. This government talks a big game about reducing red tape—

Mr Stevens: How many wind farms in Lytton?

Ms PEASE: I will take that interjection. If those opposite bothered to take note, the Port of Brisbane is in my electorate, and the Port of Brisbane has been the host of many wind turbines that have come through, so thank you for letting me highlight that. I am so thrilled to highlight that. Thank you very much—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Member for Lytton, direct your comments through the chair, thank you.

Ms PEASE: This government talks a big game about reducing red tape—I remember they are also very good at doing the chicken dance—yet here they are smothering renewables with it while letting fossil fuel projects off the hook entirely. There is no requirement for a coalmine to go through a community benefit agreement, but a tiny solar farm? You bet! Despite the LNP Premier, the member for Broadwater, directing his planning minister, the member for Kawana, to ensure that renewable energy projects face consistent approval processes with mining and agriculture, this bill does the opposite. It imposes a unique front-loaded framework onto renewable projects that require mandatory assessments and agreements before developments can even be lodged. As QREC explained—

This new pre-application requirement is completely different to the resources industry process in Queensland. Several other key aspects of the proposal go significantly beyond what would typically be considered equivalent to resources, clearly exceeding their requirements.

When the committee asked if these requirements should apply to non-renewable projects, proponents of fossil fuel developments firmly said no. Rather than aligning approval processes, the bill entrenches a more onerous system on renewables, creating a two-tiered framework that undermines Queensland's energy future.

Given this, it is clear that the bill as proposed serves only to disincentivise renewable energy investment in Queensland. The opposition can only assume that this serves to feed the Crisafulli LNP government's ideological objection to new and emerging forms of energy creation, apart from nuclear. That is not levelling the playing field; that is tipping it straight back into the 20th century. All roads lead back to their fear and their contempt for renewables. Like I said, it runs through their veins.

The more we address in this bill, the more problems we find. The changes to Economic Development Queensland strip away the independence of one of the state's key development agencies. Ministers will now have unchecked power to sack the CEO and board members at will—no reasons, no safeguards, just raw political control. I pose the questions again. Is this good policy? Does it serve the interests of Queenslanders, or does it serve the interests of executive government?

Let us turn to the Brisbane Olympics. Labor brought the games to Queensland. We fought for them and we back them, but this bill risks turning a once-in-a-generation opportunity into a textbook case of executive overreach. It overrides every major environmental, heritage and planning law in this state. It wipes away protections for koala habitats. The member for Redlands was talking about how good it is for them. What about your koala habitats down there? Member for Redlands, have you been standing up for the koalas in your electorate? Sorry, you do not get a vote from them. It silences communities, erodes the rights of traditional owners and excludes local councils from decision-making. This bill creates a special process—

A government member interjected.

Ms PEASE: Excuse me, I think the member for Redlands just said there are no koalas in the Redlands. I think that is interesting to hear. Thanks for alerting the parliament to that, member for Redlands. This bill creates a special process—

Mrs YOUNG: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Ms PEASE: I withdraw. I grew up in the Redlands and I know for sure that there are koalas in the Redlands, so thank you very much. This bill creates a special process for cultural heritage that does not require consent—

Mrs STOKER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Redlands took personal offence. She was being verbally by the member for Lytton. It was withdrawn. She cannot then double-down and do it yet again.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will look after the behaviour in the House, member for Oodgeroo.

Ms PEASE: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. This bill overrides every major environmental, heritage and planning law in this state. It wipes away protections for koala habitats, coastal dunes, wetlands and even drinking water systems. It silences communities, erodes the rights of traditional owners and excludes local councils from decision-making. This bill creates a special process for cultural heritage that does not require consent, allows default plans to be imposed and

removes the right to seek a stop-work order. I do not know about anyone else in this House, but I do not want to live in a Queensland that does this. It sounds like I am going back to my childhood under the days of Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

Let me be very clear. This is not consultation; this is coercion. This is effectively saying to the local government community of Queensland, 'We don't trust you. We need you but we don't trust you. We don't think you're up to the job.'

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair, member for Lytton.

Ms PEASE: The Bar Association of Queensland has warned that the bill's sweeping ban on civil proceedings could be unconstitutional. Legal experts agree: it breaches the rule of law and, ironically, it may delay Olympic projects even more by triggering litigation about the legislation itself.

The bill fails basic transparency tests. It allows Olympic infrastructure to proceed without public notice, without planning processes, without even an established reason for overriding Queensland laws. The public deserves better than secretive, unaccountable development with billions of taxpayers' dollars at stake. That is why the opposition is seeking amendments in consideration in detail: to allow social impact assessments and community benefit agreements to be submitted during, not before, the assessment process; to mandate publication of all Olympic infrastructure approvals and reasons for legislative overrides; to require a parliamentary vote for any additional funding, even if it is one cent over; and to replace the unconstitutional civil litigation ban with a lawful, limited safeguard that preserves the Supreme Court's authority to review government decisions.

These are reasonable, practical amendments. They protect communities without compromising project delivery. They restore transparency without delaying the games. They offer legal certainty where the government has offered only confusion. This bill is a blueprint for confusion, overreach and political interference. Queenslanders deserve better.