

Friday, September 19, 2008

**Subject:** North Bank consultation

Deputy Premier and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning  
The Honourable Paul Lucas

Dear Sir,

I wish there to be no misunderstanding or misconstruing of my opinion as I believe there has been with most citizens opinions by the total devious approach of your Government in the matter of the so called North Bank Dev.since its promotion.

**I object totally and utterly to the proposed North Bank Dev in all its conspicuous idiocy from the day of its first proposal. Since your govt. has an interpretation difficulty with a straight forward objection, this is a .....NO..... !!! to any development as proposed for the site and a .....NO.....!!! to the expropriation of Public owned Land [River] for private sector exploitation. The loss of the River and all the banal consequences that are easily seen by blind Freddy do not in any way compensate for the drivel proposed for the river bank to be so called-- activated.**

Proceeding through your document of " Wed. August 27, 2008. North Bank Open for Public Comment"

It is impossible to take this document seriously as it is just a platitude of a preconceived end result you wish to inflict upon the public rather than gather input that will be seriously considered.

The Enquiry by design was designed in a similar fashion as you did not put forward the possibility that an option for no buildings in the river be considered. Simply put the public assumes that you have so stuffed the process that you now can not get out of this stupid folly without paying compensation to " Multiplex ..."

Please advise if you are able to say.. **no..** to this project and not have to pay "Multiplex ..." any money.

**1 " Independent experts"** have not given you a clear direction; this is a lie. I have hardly seen any letter in the Courier Mali " that supports this proposal from professional Town Planners to Layman. Everybody in my profession, that I talk to, thinks it is bizarre and the consequences that it creates are worse than the disease that it is.

**2" This is the road map"** Most people don't want any of the "Parts" I will put this more clearly -- none of it whatsoever !

**3 " This plan shows"** that it is not an inner city attraction; it is near a freeway over the river; it is hard to get to--why would you go there; it wont be vibrant and it will create a greater flood risk which effected citizens will seek compensation for because of their elected Govt's stupidity and I will have to pay more taxes to compensate them.

**4 "It will turn North Bank into"** a disaster that should never have been entertained for a split second.

**5 " There were clearly concerns..... but around 80% of the community want."** Please advise what survey produced this 80% support. I only know of people who think it is stupid; that is at least 90% plus.

**6 "No one takes visitors..."** and will not in the future once this mess is constructed.

**7 " The Bligh.. is committed ... giving... the river back to the people."** This is a lie: the public already own the river and the river bank via the crown. What you are proposing to do is take the river and give it for free to private sector uses which have nothing to do with improvement of the CBD for the citizens of Brisbane and Qld.The section that you promote as being suped up will always be comprised by the Riverside freeway and even more so by your proposal to build further out into the river.

**8 " I want to make it clear...."** Spare us , you want to make nothing clear. I have not heard it stated as to what the financial position of the Govt. is to dump the proposal. The Enquiry by Design was a ruse with a preset agenda; not one that said, "Propose what you think is best with no restrictions."

**9 " These will be used by "....Multiplex"** to be allowed to continue to propose Govt. sanctioned stupidity for their private profit at the citizens of Qld expense. I read that "....Multiplex" are an alien company: so you are giving away our assets to aliens to gain a piece of junk.

10 "Reduced Footprint in the River" There should be no imprint in the river. It should not be there at all.

11 " Reduced Flood Impact" What!! Reduced from tragic to disastrous. Nothing you can propose that is built into the river reduces the flood impact as much as not building anything at all in the river . I remind you of the following:

[a] since 1974 there has been a massive increase in the amount of residential development in the catchment area with the associated increase in water run off.

[b] the river is no longer dredged to deepen its depth: hence greater water run off.

[c] Southbank narrowed the river in its development:,thus restricting the water carrying capacity of the river: hence any flooding will be worse than 1974 for an equal rain event.

[d] additional structures have been added to the river and more are proposed:the goodwill bridge, the bridge to U of Q, the tank street bridge,doubling of the centenary highway bridge, doubling of the gateway bridge, additional pedestrian bridge at Indooroopilly; all will impede the flow of water; all will catch debris to impede the flow of the river. You are talking large trees , houses, boats , dead cattle, roofing iron etc etc. It is not just little sticks The end result will be that whatever is put across at Northbank will catch its full width of obstruction whether it is 300 m long or 1000m but no doubt 1000 is worse.

[e] siltation of the river as mentioned by yourselves and the growth of mangroves to enhance the beauty of the river bank; this must restrict and lift the flood level

[f] the enormous increase in the amount of road surface in the catchment area. Just look at Ipswich Rd. Is this water just going to stand still until it behaves as the Govt. wants it to? No!

[g] Forget the Wivenhoe Dam . So you as a govt are going to say, "Let's let all the water out of Wivenhoe incase our idiocy at Northbank causes a flood problem." This after water restrictions --no way. The real scenario is that a series of lows will occur and Wivenhoe and Somerset will fill and then more rain will occur and all Brisbane will flood worse than 1974 and maybe worse than 1893. What happens then, " Oh , We designed this for the one in one hundred year event,unfortunately it just happened after the first year we built it, and then again the following year."

[h] Are the calculations used by hydraulic engineers correct? During the mayoralty of Tim Quinn these figures were questioned by an eminent hydraulic engineer. From memory, he believed they were out by about 25 to 33% and that the flood impact on Brisbane would be far greater than what had been allowed. The extra heights he was talking were in the vicinity of approx. 1metre [I have to add, this is my memory only and you could check with the Courier Mail at that time.] Your statement of a 3mm increase is a fantasy of your desire to promote this Northbank mistake.How can you talk 3mm., which would be close to immeasurable and prominent engineers say the basics of the flood could be a 1metre higher without the Northbank blockage..

12 "Public amenities" There are already public facilities there, these can be improved without giving away the river for private exploitation. Don't decorate the freeway, you are not going to change it from what it is to not being there at all. This is just a waste of money.

13 " Birthplace of Brisbane " This will more retain the character as the birthplace of Brisbane if it is unutilated by this proposal.That is fact.

14 "Visitor Information Centre and viewing Platform" Just more unnecessary rubbish to spoil the enjoyment of the river, another vista blocker.

15 "Signature Building" What's the function of this building? The money maker to pay for the other improvements to the area? As I understand the feed back from the "Enquiry by Design" the idea was to lump all the development into one location to not have any buildings over the river and save the river. This has now been exploited to have additional buildings as well. Not the intent of the idea. This building will do the same as was said about Riverside and the Riparian Building, they block any vista from the streets of Brisbane to the environment outside. It just makes Brisbane more of a canyon and says nothing about City Design to create a half acceptable city.There is no grand design in Brisbane and it will just become more of a dump.

This whole proposal was spruiked by Beattie as costing the citizens of Qld nothing. This is totally untrue it comes at an unbelievable cost. The River is alienated from the citizens ownership, the views of the river

are available to those who own the buildings above the river as they block everybody else. Scaps are thrown at the bank as compensation.

Unfortunately this govt lives by two of Murphy's laws , " If it is done wrong enough often enough it becomes right,"and, "Nothing is as inevitable as a mistake whose time has come."

This project was easy to asses as a non- goer from the first moment it was proposed. It should never have been given any air whatsoever to waste the Govt's and citizens time.

The reasons for its continuum lead one to suspect all the worst possible behaviour of a Govt. against the citizens it's supposed to represent and protect public owned land from foreigners whose only motive is profit, not a more civic Brisbane.

Russell Hall