




Speech By
Shane King

MEMBER FOR KURWONGBAH

Record of Proceedings, 25 June 2025

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

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (3.54 pm): I rise today to speak on the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Sadly, it is a bill filled with blatant double standards and is another example of the LNP rushing through legislation with the barest of scrutiny. It is interesting that the LNP pretends to champion local governments. ‘We’re listening,’ they say; ‘They don’t want wind farms,’ they say. However, when it comes to the Olympics, the LNP cannot trust councils to stay on schedule and cannot trust councils to get it right on planning—the very thing councils are designed to do. We should not be surprised, though, with a planning minister who is calling in developments left, right and centre because he does not agree with the assessments of council—the same councils he is listening to. This is a minister, however, who said, ‘Resetting the relationship with local government starts with listening.’ It is clear the LNP only ‘listens’ to things they want to hear, just like the antirenewable energy sentiment from the member for Mirani, who I understand—I was not there but I read it in the media—commandeered a committee flight to complain about wind farms in his area.

We knew when the LNP cancelled pumped hydro last year that they were not on the renewable energy bandwagon. As an electrician from the power supply industry and a proud member of the mighty Electrical Trades Union, I have a lot of conversations about energy and I have always found people to be pretty positive about renewable energy. Of course, I have heard some good old conspiracy theories about wind turbines, and I am sure we will hear some more during this debate: birds fly into them, they explode all the time, the parts cost the earth, they are too noisy. Let me read some information about wind turbines from a page that was last updated in February this year, under the term of this government. It states—

A 3.5MW wind turbine can power around 2,100 homes and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by about 7,100t annually. That’s the equivalent of taking about 2,300 petrol cars off the road.

A government member interjected.

Mr KING: If you listened, you would learn something. The quote continues—

Modern wind turbines are designed to be as quiet as possible. The average noise level of a wind turbine is 40-50 decibels at around 500m. That’s quieter than a lawnmower and even a dishwasher.

...

When the wind stops, turbines can rotate for hours, and continue to produce energy.

A government member interjected.

Mr KING: Here are some more facts from the same webpage, and I will take that interjection because old mate beside me will get some information in a minute about that. The same webpage which was last updated on 22 May 2025—not that long ago—stated—

Wind turbines are responsible for less than 0.01% of human-related bird deaths—much less than traditional energy production, high-rise buildings, or cats.

And—

... studies have found that nuclear and fossil fuel power plants cause over 2,000 times more bird deaths than wind farms.

Guess where I found this information. It was on Queensland Treasury's webpage, updated under this government. Anyone who gets up and bleats about bird-killing wind turbines will have the Treasurer to deal with. I cannot understand why members in this place would want more nuclear and fossil fuels that kill 2,000 times more birds. It leads me to ask: why do they hate birds? What did the birds ever do to you guys?

I am also on the committee that examined this legislation, and what stakeholders told us was alarming. To start with, not meeting the standards for fundamental legislative principles is a bad look. I need to speak here as an ex-chair of a committee. FLPs should be addressed and, as our statement of reservation states, we were not happy with the lack of regard for FLPs. Being a chair—from my perspective, at least, from when I was—was about producing a report that best reflected the views of stakeholders, not just making a minister have an easy read that pumps up his tyres. The number of stakeholders who will read this report about this rushed legislation and wonder why their views were not listened to will be staggering.

Cate Heyworth-Smith KC, the President of the Bar Association of Queensland—someone who should have a pretty good view—summed up stakeholders' views of this bill very well in my opinion when she said—

Aside from the breathtaking dismantling of the rights of individuals, this appears very much to be a challenge to the institutional integrity of the Supreme Court by state legislation. It would be unsurprising to this committee, with respect, that there is High Court authority which may be called in aid of having that legislation struck down.

They are pretty strong words. Not only will this legislation undermine the state's renewable energy targets—possibly national targets too—it enshrines a double standard, a two-tiered system where different rules apply to proponents of renewable energy and non-renewable energy projects. Katie Mulder, the CEO of the Queensland Renewable Energy Council, said—

There is also inconsistency with other land use frameworks. We align with the mining industry in noting that the proposed social impact assessment and community benefit agreement requirements are not consistent with how social impacts are managed in the resources sector.

Making life and business harder for renewable energy proponents sends a message from this government that, 'We do not want your business in Queensland,' as was noted in the Clean Energy Council submission when they said—

The lack of transitional provisions, indicative timeframes, or a clear pathway for progressing applications where good-faith engagement has occurred on existing proposals is unwarranted. Uncertainty around how and when the new Social Impact Assessment (SIA) and Community Benefit Agreement (CBA) requirements apply is already affecting investor confidence and project delivery timelines.

This is especially critical for proponents who have made substantial commitments under the current framework, including grid connection agreements, council engagement, and land access negotiations, and are now facing the possibility of being required to restart the process under the new rules. Without a clear and fair transition, this effectively introduces retrospective regulation, undermining the confidence of investors and developers who have acted in good faith.

They have done this without having modelled the impact of this new regulation on investment in our state, or on our local economies. They have not even predicted the impact of this red tape on energy prices. So much for caring about the cost of living!

Labor had a plan for energy prices. We had a plan for jobs and energy. This government makes incoherent, non-transparent energy policy on the run to appease the same local governments they are happy to override in other areas, and pursue their antirenewables, pro-coal agenda.

In conclusion, we love the Olympics. That is why our former Labor government bid for them. I am so proud to say I was part of the government who secured the 2032 Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games. None of those opposite can say that. I will conclude by putting on the record my disappointment to think that the LNP is deliberately setting back the renewable energy industry simultaneously with this legislation.