



City Planning and Economic Development (Industrial Strategy Review)
Brisbane City Council
GPO Box 1434
Brisbane Q 4001

20 August 2021

To the Responsible Officer

COMMITTEE FOR BRISBANE SUBMISSION ON BRISBANE INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY REVIEW

The Committee for Brisbane's Vision is for greater Brisbane to be the world's most liveable place.

Our aspiration is for the city to be the best place in the world for people to live, work and play. Employment opportunity and employment security are critical to the city's liveability; and how a city curates its industrial and manufacturing sectors has a major influence on its employment profile.

The Committee for Brisbane thanks Brisbane City Council for initiating a review of its Industrial Strategy and we have provided responses to specific components of the Strategy below. There were many contributors to this document, and they are listed on page 4.

In addition to its feedback on the Strategy, the Committee encourages the Council to consider developing a longer-term view – **an Industry and Manufacturing Vision** – to provide the framework for attracting investment in this critical part of the city and regional economy.

Committee for Brisbane members would be very pleased to contribute to that process.

The Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games provide more than a decade of opportunity for the city and region to determine just what sort of society we will be when, according to AOC President John Coates AC, half of the world's eyes will be watching Brisbane at the Olympic Games opening ceremony.

The opportunities for the city's future, including its industrial sector, are reflected in a variety of planning instruments, including the *Brisbane Industrial Strategy*, *Shaping SEQ: South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017*, *Transforming SEQ: The SEQ City Deal Proposition*, *Queensland Advanced Manufacturing 10-Year Roadmap and Action Plan*, *Brisbane Economic Development Plan 2031* and *Brisbane's Global Precincts*.

The Committee considered, and drew inspiration from, all these documents in developing this proposal for an Industry and Manufacturing Vision.

We recognise that the Brisbane Industrial Strategy is a future-looking document, developed in response to the "strong demand for limited supply of industrial land from both industrial and non-industrial users".

We believe, with the emergence of new industries and technologies, that there is an opportunity to revisit the concept of what an industrial zone looks like, how industry links with other commercial, recreational and residential activities, and how Brisbane can best position itself to attract and accommodate a broad range of manufacturing and post-manufacturing industry.

We consider that industry and manufacturing will be some of the most (positively) disrupted sectors of our economy. The pace of technological change, through robotics, AI and the Internet of Things, will bring cleaner and more efficient industry to our city.

Industry of the future will not be just sparks, noises and smells, it will be robotic, technology-led and scientific, and the city will need a planning framework that is flexible and nimble enough to accommodate these new industries, within a forward thinking administrative framework.

The Committee for Brisbane believes the city's Industrial Strategy should foster a regionally aware approach that leverages our competitive advantage internationally, whilst enabling responsiveness to changes in consumer trends, land demands and economic conditions.

The Strategy should positively add to the consolidation of our urban form and link to other strategies and policies relating to transport, knowledge corridors and renewal.

With about two million more residents projected to live in South East Queensland over the next 25 years, the significant increase in consumer demand will need to be supported by a significant increase in industry and manufacturing, and the employment growth that will deliver.

We propose an Industry and Manufacturing Vision that informs a Strategy to attract the smartest, most entrepreneurial and largest employers to Brisbane - a Vision and Strategy that ensure the city continues to leverage its competitive advantages as a successful industrial business environment.

As competition for talent builds, we seek an environment that enables and encourages business investment by ensuring that good ideas, strong commercial propositions and key attractors grow our industry and manufacturing sectors.

There are many examples across Brisbane where this has occurred, although they have often had to navigate complex approvals that didn't strictly accord with zoning patterns or use definitions, for example Green Beacon Brewing at Teneriffe, and the Mercedes Benz Autohaus and Vald at Newstead.

The Committee affirms that 'first principles' town planning should always have a place in the application of policy, coupled with a policy environment that enables activity to create success.

The 2032 Olympics and Paralympics will take place mid-way through the Planning Horizon, so our city has an opportunity to set an aspirational policy platform that we can demonstrate through successfully delivered projects, by the time the world visits and watches in 11 years.

Brisbane could support high value research activities and businesses within our industrial areas, for example by enabling an Australian sports ecosystem, where sports grounds, facilities and administrations are co-located with sports science and technology providers, medical and well-being services and business coaching (this is one of the Committee's goals in its Olympics and Paralympics Legacies paper).

The Committee believes the city needs a responsive policy that can adapt to a fast-changing economy. We are not proposing a Vision and Strategy that adapts to whatever works, rather the development of strong principles that allow policy enactment to be founded on economic pragmatism.

We believe that connecting SIAs, UEAs and MIAs, both logistically and economically, is fundamental to the success of the sector. As businesses grow beyond the scope of SIAs and UEAs, there must be adaptability within MIAs to allow for flexible uses so businesses can mature, otherwise we risk losing successful and growing businesses to other cities, states or countries.

The Committee proposes that the Industry and Manufacturing Vision and Strategy are based on a set of core principles:

- Flexibility – planning and zoning principles allow for broader activities based on local impacts and synergies, rather than purely by industry (i.e., activity-based planning, not industry-based planning)

- Responsiveness – planning and zoning settings are adaptable and can embrace the emergence of new technologies and industries.
- Connectivity – zoning and planning policies facilitate easier connectivity between activity nodes, encourage precinct development based on commonalities, and encourage the emergence of cosmopolitan regions that include residential, commercial, cultural and industrial activities.

The Committee would be pleased to discuss this proposal further and commends Brisbane City Council for progressing the Industrial Strategy review.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Barton Green', is positioned above the typed name and title.

BARTON GREEN

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

barton@committeeforbrisbane.org.au

0411 702 209

Response Overview

Our response has focused on responding to three key elements of the Brisbane Industrial Strategy Review:

1. Major Industrial Areas (MIAs);
2. Urban Enterprise Areas (UAEs); and
3. Citywide Catalysts.

Contributors

The following representatives from CFB's Corporate Membership contributed to this submission.

Name	Position	Organisation
Damian Reardon	Senior Urban Designer	Bennett and Bennett
Mark Case	Associate Director	Ethos Urban
Angus Halligan	Associate Director, Planning	
Paul Bickham	Director	Faction Consulting
Rod Walker	Development & Investment Manager	ISPT
Chris McCluskey	GM Development Services	
Nic Gilbert	Senior Research Manager	Lendlease
Gurdip Singh	Business Development Director - Qld, Development, Property	
Simon Forsyth	State Director, Queensland	Mecone
Justin O'Neill	Principal	O'Neill Architecture
Michael Bailey	Director	Open Architecture Studio
Angus Green	Director	Place Design Group
David Hertweck	Senior Manager, Environment and Planning	Port of Brisbane
David Skerrett	Director, Real Estate Advisory	PwC
Isaac Naumann	Senior Consultant, Real Estate Advisory	
Paul Rigo	Executive	Stratagility
Andrew Thompson	Director	Thompson and Partners
Meredith Hartigan	Principal Town Planner	Tract
Sophie Lam	Associate Director, Planning	Urbis
Ed Johnson	Associate Director, Planning	
Barton Green	CEO	Committee for Brisbane
Julian Page	Policy & Research Manager	

Major Industrial Areas

Submission points and questions for BCC

Area	<i>CFB Comments for Consideration</i>
Future Proofing In context of Global Trends / infrastructure requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgment that the future of industrial activity will have greater automation and will require less “factory/warehouse and production jobs” - more jobs will be in the knowledge intensive end of the value chains / office (design/engineering/marketing/sales or laboratory based) and more akin to office and laboratory spaces. • The Port’s ability to cater for larger vessels will be constrained by channel depth and the capacity of the Future Port Expansion area to accept maintenance dredging material from natural river siltation. The region will therefore need a longer-term solution for maintain channel depth / accommodating dredged material placement (ie post the Future Port Expansion and Fisherman Islands). • Freight rail connectivity to the port is also a significant issue at present. • The Committee welcomes the commencement of upgrades associated with the NorthWest Transport Network and the duplication of the Centenary Bridge • Additional local transport network improvements will influence industrial land in coming years: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. local rail system upgrades and investment in light rail. ii. the completion of Cross River Rail and Brisbane Metro. iii. level crossing removal.
Supply & Demand Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater consideration should be given to industrial land supply and user types within the wider context of SEQ, as they are complementary. • We are experiencing systemic growth in the demand for industrial space due to ecommerce and its accelerated expansion during the pandemic. A supply response is required to support continued growth of Brisbane and SEQ economic activity generally. • Heavy industrial uses might be overall more suited to other LGAs - Brisbane LGA should have focus on the higher end of the value chain to align with workforce demographics and land scarcity. Total reliance on other areas to accommodate heavy industrial uses is not likely to be the solution, however. • There has historically been limited depth of demand for large users in SEQ, with the occupation of these types of users being ‘lumpy’. These activities should be focused on areas with the best connectivity / transport networks - ATC (east of Gateway) and West (surrounding Archerfield and inland freight terminal) • The regional realities of SEQ’s industrial network and supply chain connectivity needs to be explicitly included. Despite Brisbane’s size, constraints on industrial land supply are such that areas outside of BCC’s jurisdiction will inevitably play a heightened role in serving the city and the State. This may include the future development of industrial hubs / inland port facilities at locations such as Ebenezer, Charlton-Wellcamp, Dinmore/Redbank/Swanbank and Bromelton. • The Strategy focuses on the Australian Trade Coast on the eastern area, which is most of the Tradecoast. It talks to continuing to accommodate heavy uses such as waste treatment, abattoirs and oil refineries, with no mention of logistics/distribution. Logistics/distribution which rely heavily on the importing of containers must be encouraged in these areas given the proximity to the Port and Airport. • There is also significant demand for vehicle sales and rentals in the ATC in Pinkenba/Hendra area due to the proximity to the airport and Automall which are very difficult to locate in the industrial zoning as they are defined as Showroom or Outdoor Sales. Implementing Centre or Mixed-Use Zones here could provide a favourable outcomes.
Planning Constraints, Design &	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design should be market-led and flexible enough to adapt to user requirements in an environment of rapidly changing technology and industrial activities. • The strategy is generally silent on the TradeCoast area west of the Gateway Bridge. The State Government has recently released the Colmslie Road TLPI. This area should be identified within the BIS for neighborhood planning as a priority. Realistically, this area is fringe of the TradeCoast, surrounded by residential,

Area	<i>CFB Comments for Consideration</i>
Product Requirements	<p>adjacent to the future Olympic and Paralympics Athletes Village (Northshore Hamilton) and has the ability to deliver a significant riverfront bicycle connection and provide great amenity to the river and the surrounding Council reserves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategy document talks about the future design composition of MIAs of ‘what creates a successful MIA’. The ideas are consistent with BCC’s push across other land uses (such as commercial and retail) – greenspaces, public transport, digital, public spaces, infrastructure and sustainability. From a visionary perspective it is accepted that they will deliver better, sustainable property outcomes. In addition, they will allow better integration of industrial land around adjoining uses, which the strategy is seeking to achieve. • The practicality of delivering the parks and transport infrastructure Council is ideally wanting to see in MIAs, however, is to be questioned and will need to be investigated further. Industrial buildings will continue to be reused into the future, rather than redeveloped, which may lead to partial construction of pathways and bike paths which don’t have any clear link. • Regarding the concept of wider pathways and bike paths, consideration needs to be given as to whether in a practical sense these would really be used – these are perhaps a “nice to have”, but not if the patronage is not there to support it. • The MIAs will be an area in which the Amendment K Warehouse parking rates will have a significant impact. These rates may not go far enough to reduce parking requirements (going from 1 space per 100sqm, to 1 space per 100sqm up to 10,000sqm GFA plus 1 space per 150sqm above 10,000sqm GFA). They also don’t offer the flexibility to provide parking that is aligned with the type of use and especially if that use has low staff numbers (which Council has already flagged is a major part of the future of industry with robotics and the increase in distribution and logistics uses). • Regarding carparking, the following ratios may be more appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 per 100m² GFA where below 7,500m² ○ 1 per 150m² GFA where over 7,500m² ○ 1 per 200m² GFA where over 15,000m² ○ 1 per 300m² GFA where over 25,000m² • Amendment K seeks to require a minimum tenancy size of 15,000m² GFA for warehousing in the IN3 zone. This is a significant requirement and appears contrary to the intent of the strategy which talks to a “proliferation” of warehouses. There is a limited number of sites that can accommodate a 15,000m² warehouse as it would require 3 ha of site area. Reducing this to ~5,000 m² of GFA - would lead to it being considered ‘Major Development’ by the TAPS PSP, assuming a trip generation of 0.5 per 100m². • Consideration should be given to land covered in the MIA that is no longer suitable for heavy industry or logistics uses, which can offer higher and more productive uses (medium density residential and amenity in suburban areas), this can align with “missing middle” objectives.
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability and energy efficiency objectives should be realistic and ensure that the sustainable base building design is achievable. Sustainability criteria for industrial occupiers must be achievable in the context of the sectors heavy reliance on transportation, machinery, manufacturing, and robotics.
Feasibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onerous design and place requirements may drive up costs for developers (development margins are already low by industry standards). • Greater composition of greenspaces, public areas and walkways decreases the density of land developed. Roads, walkways and public transport are high-cost items that need to be paid for and generally these costs are easier to absorb across higher density/land value/rental paying uses (e.g. retail and commercial). The extent of these functions being mandated in development is likely to lead to a fundamental change in the cost of developing new industrial product. A key question is whether the cost is something occupiers will be willing to absorb. • For context, the City of Sydney has recently pushed a focus on infrastructure to and around industrial uses. The solution there has been to increase infrastructure contributions – a direct cost to owners, developers and occupiers, which has been poorly received, particularly amongst small businesses.

Area	<i>CFB Comments for Consideration</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The prescribed open spaces and amenity provision are only likely to be feasible at a scale where developers are able to masterplan precincts. These opportunities are few and far between within the Brisbane LGA. • Significantly higher industrial land prices and housing densities would be required to support multi-level industrial facilities – these outcomes are barely feasible in Sydney. • Fragmented ownership and long-dated lease lengths for industrial users or high capex spend for manufacturing facilities makes it very hard for developers to consolidate land holdings.
Port of Brisbane	<p>Port of Brisbane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Port of Brisbane’s (PBPL) desire is to improve rail’s modal share of the regional freight task. Presently <2% of freight movement to and from the Port are accommodated by rail. With trade in containers alone forecast to multiply several-fold by 2040, without an improvement in rail freight capacity the following will be experienced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increased congestion / reduced economic efficiency / lost productivity b. Compromised road safety c. Increase road maintenance costs d. Increased greenhouse emissions e. Constraints on rail passenger traffic <p>The case for dedicated freight rail connectivity is detailed here and in the graphic attached in the Appendix: https://www.portbris.com.au/getmedia/b793e8b5-ede-4945-850f-6feec8835720/DAE-Connecting-Inland-Rail-to-the-Port-of-Brisbane.pdf. An increase to ~30% rail mode share would deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2.4 million less truck movements on regional roads per year ○ Around \$820 million in economic, social and environmental benefits annually ○ An average of 1,200 new jobs annually to 2045 ○ \$195 million in reduced congestion costs ○ \$155 million in reduced road maintenance costs ○ \$215 million in savings from reduced greenhouse gas emissions ○ \$210 million in increased international export value <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PBPL is advocating for improvements in local industrial infrastructure. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. upgrades to the southern confluence of the Port of Brisbane Motorway with the Gateway Motorway (a regular site of traffic congestion) b. upgrades to road and stormwater infrastructure and landscaping / public realm throughout Myrtletown (now a notable gateway to the City with the recent completion of the Brisbane International Cruise Terminal) • PBBL is working on the integration of sustainability across all aspects of its industrial business: https://www.portbris.com.au/sustainability/our-commitment/ including a 2030 commitment to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Air quality - No National Environmental Protection (NEPM) exceedances b. Energy efficiency geared to net zero scope 1 and 2 emissions c. Waste – zero waste to landfill and net positive water d. Improved water quality outcomes (see 2 below) e. Improved biodiversity on port land and in the buffer/conservation areas fringing the Port of Brisbane Pty Ltd

Area	<i>CFB Comments for Consideration</i>
	<p data-bbox="465 225 1576 248">f. Achieve a minimum 4-star Green Star or ISCA equivalent for all new Property and Port infrastructure projects</p> <p data-bbox="465 284 1951 368">On a broader canvas it is suggested that BCC and the development industry address, and in partnership pursue, the opportunities to generate significant income / cost savings through innovative investment in renewable energy. For example, the development of Virtual Energy Networks designed to cover operational energy cost and augment industrial income streams.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="398 389 1968 448">• The adoption of more innovative ‘WIN-WIN’ infrastructure investment strategies, for example PBPL’s Offsite Stormwater Management scheme in which PBPL has already partnered with BCC and other LGA / business and community stakeholders, could work to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="465 469 1037 493">a. Significantly reduce development infrastructure costs <li data-bbox="465 496 1075 520">b. Reduce on-site provisions for water detention / retention <li data-bbox="465 523 1532 547">c. Improve environmental outcomes (e.g. improved water quality, reduced erosion, enhanced biodiversity) <li data-bbox="465 550 1173 574">d. Improved food security in agricultural areas via reduced topsoil loss <li data-bbox="465 577 1386 601">e. Reduced long-term dredging requirements as less sediment is deposited in water courses <p data-bbox="465 644 1659 668">PBPL would suggest a broader roll-out of such schemes: https://www.portbris.com.au/major-projects/offsite-stormwater/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="398 692 1592 718">• PBBL is keen to further explore the potential of emerging transport technologies / systems including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="465 738 1364 762">a. vehicle automation, EVs and vehicles using alternative fuels (e.g. biofuel, hydrogen etc) <li data-bbox="465 766 768 790">b. freight vehicle platooning <li data-bbox="465 793 1375 817">c. the broader use of Higher Productivity Vehicles throughout the regional freight network <li data-bbox="465 820 804 844">d. dedicated freight road routes <li data-bbox="465 847 815 871">e. shared truck marshalling areas <li data-bbox="465 874 689 898">f. drone technology <li data-bbox="465 901 808 925">g. improved freight data sharing

Urban Enterprise Areas

Submission points and questions for BCC:

1. There appears to be an overlap with the Bowen Hills PDA and the Urban Enterprise Area (UEA). As the UEA is a strategy element that will ultimately be reflected in amendments to City Plan, it may be most appropriate to exclude areas not within BCC's planning jurisdiction.
2. Given the vision expressed for UEAs to accommodate a broad range of uses, the relevant implementation actions should also include committed infrastructure outcomes and incentivisation frameworks to ensure the UEAs are delivered, rather than remaining as underutilised inner-city land.
3. The UEAs as currently positioned in the refresh document seek to accommodate a broad range of uses, however, the true future characterisation of the UEAs is somewhat unclear. It is noted that –
 - a. only industrial zoned land is included in the UEA overlay - if a variety of uses are anticipated, a variety of zones should be included.
 - b. The intent of the UEAs appears to be quite similar to that propositioned by the mixed-use zone that already exists within City Plan.
 - c. The overlay may be interpreted as an attempt to further limit the redevelopment of near-city land.
4. The creation of the UEAs may be interpreted as an additional layer of planning control restricting the market direction for use of near-city land, by placing the land 'on hold' and not allowing it to be whittled away to higher value uses such as residential. This appears to conflict with the historical and highly successful urban renewal programs championed by BCC.
5. Is it proposed to redefine industry uses as part of an amendment to City Plan? The new industry that is spoken of within the strategy refresh is somewhat unclear at this stage, but further work may be required to establish a framework that can practically link the new definition with the outcomes sought within the UEAs.
6. Mixing industry and non-industry uses may result in non-optimal outcomes and value propositions for both uses. If the intent is to have the industry component as the primary component, incentivisation will need to be carefully considered, given the value of the EAU land in a near-city context.
7. Sport and Recreation uses, which have historically occupied land / premises in these areas, have been excluded from the UEA concept. In working toward the vision of delivering high amenity precincts with services to support employment, Sport and Recreation should be important considerations.
8. The notion of a UEA being a high-intensity employment generator will likely require employment hubs to be accommodated over a number of floors. This is achievable with a new type of industry definition that encompasses commercial as a predominant element, supporting ground plane-based production. The original SICIA provisions seemed to allow for this concept, more so than the current proposed UEA policy.
9. Urban Enterprises should be friendly neighbours with reasonable acoustic and odour outputs allowing for adjacency to high levels of habitation. As such, the "industry" may actually be the least dominant use in terms of urban form as storeys above could easily be 8-12. This would enable the area to incorporate active streetscapes with urban density.

Citywide Catalysts

Catalyst 1 – Championing Brisbane’s Innovators and Makers

Brisbane Industrial Strategy Review			<i>CFB Comments for BCC Consideration</i>	
Item	Responsibility	Action	Other Responsibility	Comments
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brisbane EDA • BCC 	Promote Brisbane’s industrial capabilities and achievements through a range of forums and media including the development of promotional material and chairing of business forums.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brisbane EDA • BCC • State and Federal government? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining who we are promoting to is important – are we promoting to Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, or further abroad? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Under ‘Brisbane’s Competitive Advantage’ there are lots of references to the SEQ region. ○ State and Federal Government will also need have input in promotion.
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queensland Government • Brisbane EDA • BCC 	Encourage the continued establishment of high value niche manufacturing facilities in Brisbane by connecting researchers and developers with investors, property owners and property developers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queensland Government • Brisbane EDA • BCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are we promoting? This strategy would be a good place to make these strengths and opportunities very clear so there is a clear link between this action and the strategy. • What are the timeframes we are working towards? The Strategy is an opportunity to look long-term, but a lack of timeframes may portray a lack of vision/foresight.
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queensland Government • Brisbane EDA • BCC 	Support ongoing innovation of distribution, warehousing and manufacturing businesses by attracting investment and connecting businesses with investors, property owners and property developers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queensland Government • Brisbane EDA • BCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is success measured? • Is there still a place for industry that does not fall into the category of ‘high value niche manufacturing’? Is the intention to push this elsewhere? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There will still be a role for ‘traditional’ industry, particularly warehousing, that may not be captured by this goal.

Catalyst 2 – Moving People, Goods and Ideas

Brisbane Industrial Strategy Review			CFB Comments for BCC Consideration	
Item	Responsibility	Action	Responsibility	Comments
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal Government 	Complete the Inland Rail connection between the Acacia Ridge Intermodal Terminal and the Port of Brisbane.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal State? Private? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximise Port of Brisbane (1st and last port in Australia) - this has been on the table for 10-20 years and would take 5-10 years to implement. BCC has the opportunity to be the catalyst for championing its creation. Existing road and rail networks are under stress. Roads are not sustainable, and the city needs to reduce traffic emissions. Need to strive to mitigate double handling between road and rail. Need to resolve conflicts between rail and road as rail is planned/regulated and road freight is more of a free market. Rail has the benefit of moving high volumes and a dedicated line should be dual track / double stacked / require passing loops and will likely require an element of tunnelling so it is a large investment. Project needs to be State led with State/Federal funding, however an alliance between the private sector and Government could be investigated.
2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal Government BCC 	Review the freight network, with the support of key stakeholders including the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator, to ensure that industrial zoned land can be appropriately serviced by heavy vehicles.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal BCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Containerised traffic is key, particularly in the first and last kilometres. Road and rail interfaces need to be the focus. Need to incentivise freight to local rail hubs, not just to Port of Brisbane.
2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Government BCC 	Explore public transport coverage and service frequency to industrial precincts to support an increase in public transport patronage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Government BCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated bus/train timetables to provide seamless interchanges will be required. Minimising transfers will be a challenge (more than one is a deterrent). Many industrial processes are more and more using robotics/mechanisation and therefore patronage may be lower. Benefit to be considered given the 24/7 requirements and traffic predominantly based around start/finish times of shifts.
2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCC 	Provide active transport connections between key hubs and destinations within industrial precincts and residential areas to support active transport use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider park-and-ride in close proximity to industrial parks.
2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal Government 	Improve the speed, reliability and capacity of Brisbane's digital networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fed BCC? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High speed fibre reliability to attract robotics / full mechanisation. Consider BCC-funded infrastructure and Smart City Initiatives.

Catalyst 3 – Creating Modern Industrial Precincts

Brisbane Industrial Strategy Review			CFB Comments for BCC Consideration	
Item	Responsibility	Action	Responsibility	Comments
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brisbane EDA • BCC 	<p>Establish an ongoing industrial renewal program for Brisbane to ensure individual industrial precincts are well positioned to attract and retain a range of businesses.</p> <p>The scope of this program could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying appropriate land uses including locations for service hubs • developing new building and site design provisions • determining and prioritising infrastructure requirements • identifying locations for new public spaces and streetscape upgrades • working with the building and construction industry and landowners to facilitate the delivery of the elements of successful industrial precincts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brisbane EDA • BCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of ‘Renewal’ is somewhat unclear, as this may mean evolutionary change (new industrial buildings) or revolutionary change (new uses). • From a visionary perspective, the goal of high amenity industrial precincts is inherently positive as they will deliver more sustainable property outcomes. The feasibility of these initiatives will need to be tested further with developers and owners, particularly in the MIAs. With appropriate policy and flexibility, feasible and high amenity outcomes may be possible.
3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Government • Private sector 	<p>Establish start-up and scale-up spaces across Brisbane, including completion of the Translational Research Institute II at Boggo Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brisbane EDA • BCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any start-up and scale-up focus will need to be targeted to areas with existing strengths and aligning these with needs / future demands. • Brisbane does not yet have the critical mass to support a scatter-gun approach for seeding start-ups.
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BCC 	<p>Implement new statutory actions to support this strategy and continue to advance statutory actions from the Brisbane Industrial Strategy 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further guidance on the nature of proposed statutory actions is required to understand implications to the industrial sector.
3.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BCC 	<p>Monitor Brisbane’s industrial land supply and demand in the context of the SEQ region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The context of SEQ is important - looking to adjacent LGAs such as Logan for heavy industrial and freight and logistics places significant reliance on infrastructure provision to this area. Land at the Port needs to be leveraged for obvious efficiencies. • The regional realities of the Queensland freight landscape need to be considered and areas further afar leveraged for inland industrial hubs, for example in Charlton-Wellcamp. • Without significant, new large scale supply of industrial land, economic activity in Brisbane and SEQ will remain constrained.

The benefits of CONNECTING INLAND RAIL TO THE PORT OF BRISBANE

VIA A DEDICATED
FREIGHT RAIL LINK



2.4 million
trucks off the road



\$820 million
annually in economic
and community
benefits

- Making roads safer
- Making communities more liveable
- Reducing emissions from trucks

- More jobs for Queensland
- Boosting Queensland trade
- Reducing road maintenance



1200 new jobs per year
between now
and 2045



\$195 million
saved in
congestion
costs each year



\$210 million
in additional
global export
value



\$215 million
savings in
reduced emissions
associated with
road to rail switch



\$155 million
road maintenance
savings with fewer
heavy vehicles on
the road



\$90 million
reduction in
road crashes
and accidents



\$130 savings
per TEU
(container)



EXTRA
capacity on
passenger
rail network
with separation
of freight

Source: DAE, 30% rail modal share

www.portbris.com.au

PORT of BRISBANE
Here for the future