

# Appendix D – LGIP Checklist

Appendix D is part of Statutory Guideline 03/14 – Local government infrastructure plans

Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) checklist					To be completed by local government		To be completed by appointed reviewer		
LGIP guideline outcome	LGIP component	Number	Requirement	Requirement met (yes/no)	Local government comments	Compliant (yes/no)	Justification	Corrective action description	Recommendation
<b>Review principles:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reference in the checklist to the LGIP Template is taken to include a relevant reference to the SPA, statutory guideline for LGIPs, statutory guideline for MALPI or the Queensland Planning Provisions (QPP).</li> <li>Compliance requirements are not limited to the requirements listed in the checklist.</li> </ul>									
The LGIP is consistent with the legislation and statutory guideline for LGIPs	All	1.	The LGIP sections are ordered in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	The State's LGIP Template document has been used as the basis of GRC's LGIP with only minor amendments	Partial	The format and order of the LGIP is consistent with the template. There has been a slight variation in the numbering which is immaterial to the legibility of the LGIP.		Council could make some small adjustment to the numbering to line up with the template however this is not critical to proceeding to the next step.
		2.	The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme.	Yes		Yes	None required		
		3.	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes	None required		
		4.	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Yes		Partial	As noted at 1. Above	As noted at 1. Above	
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions (to those in the QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements.	Yes	Some additional definitions have been included but do not conflict with QPP	Yes	Only those additional definitions have been included which are not otherwise defined by the <i>Planning Act or Regulations</i>	None required	
	Preliminary section	6.	The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The State's LGIP Template document has been used as the basis of GRCs LGIP with only minor amendments	Yes		None required	
		7.	All five trunk networks included in the LGIP. If not, which networks are excluded? Why have these networks been excluded?	Yes	Trunk Stormwater has been clearly identified as being excluded from the list of trunk infrastructure. These have been excluded on the basis of limited detail and materiality	Yes	This is consistent with the earlier version of the LGIP where trunk stormwater was excluded. Some additional provisions have been included in the LGIP to clarify that the standards of service shown in the LGIP is to provide information to community in relation to non-trunk infrastructure	None required	
	Planning assumptions - structure	8.	The drafting of the Planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The State's LGIP Template document has been used as the basis of GRC's LGIP	Yes	This document has also been revised in light of some adjustments to the LGIP including for example the inclusion of ultimate development/capacity. There is consistency and alignment between the LGIP and PAR	None required	Some minor editorial/errors were found in the PAR – they are immaterial and were noted to the Council for correction and quality purposes only.

		9.	All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa.	Yes	SA2 areas listed in the tables have been shown in the mapping.	Yes		None required	
		10.	All the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant PFTI maps and vice versa.	Yes	Service catchments listed in the tables have been shown in the mapping.	Yes		None required	
	<b>Planning assumptions - methodology</b>	11.	The population and dwelling projections reflect those prepared by the Qld Government Statistician (as available at the time of preparation).	Yes	Population and Dwellings projections reflect the OESR SA_2 projections provided March 2014. It is noted that updated projections are now available, though GRC considers that, due the LGIP advanced stage in the process, it is not reasonable to amend the LGIP to suit the updated projections.	Yes	Changes in the industry and associated (likely) reduced net in migration to the region are showing up in latest population estimates for Gladstone region which still show growth, but at a more modest rate. The effect of more modest growth will be to delay the delivery of growth related infrastructure. The reviewer supports Council's position that the advanced nature of the LGIP suggests it should proceed without further revision to reflect the 2016 data. Doing so would also jeopardise Council's ability to meet the extensions timeframe.	None required	For noting: The next scheduled review of the LGIP should consider latest population projections and data, and subsequently review timing of/need for growth related trunk infrastructure.
		12.	The employment and non-residential development projections align with the available economic development studies, other reports about employment or historical rates for the area.	Yes	Employment and non-residential projections based on OESR SA_2 and PIP modelling which in turn broadly align with existing surveys as available in 2014	Yes	These also align with the data relied upon in the development of the planning scheme.	None required	
		13.	The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding.	Yes	A statement to this effect with a list of the constraints is included in the LGIP	Yes	These constraints are noted in the LGIP	None required	
		14.	The planned densities reflect realistic levels and types of development having regard to the planning scheme provisions and current development trends.	Yes	The planned densities have been updated for the Centre zone, Neighbourhood zone, Specialised Centre zone, High Impact Industry zone and Community Facilities zone in accordance with Condition 2 of the Ministerial Conditions from the Minister's review	Yes	It is understood that these reflect the discussions between Council and the Department prior to public notification.	None required	
		15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes		Yes		None required	
		16.	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the QPP definition.	Yes	The ultimate capacity (ultimate development) has been identified in a manner consistent with the requirements of the LGIP Guideline, as detailed in the Further Advice from the Minister's review	Yes	This reflects advice from the Minister to include and has been done. Update to the PAR also reflects this ultimate capacity concept and projections.	None required	
		17.	Based on the information in the projection tables and other available material, it is possible to verify the remaining capacity to accommodate growth, for each projection	Yes		Yes		None required	

		area.						
	18.	The planning assumptions reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	Planning assumptions have been aligned with demand, current market conditions and known intent as advised by the development community.	Yes	See also 11 above.	None required	
	19.	Has the Department of Transport and Main Roads or any relevant distributor-retailer been consulted in the preparation of the LGIP? What was the outcome of the consultation?	Yes	Regular consultation occurred with DTMR as part of the development of DTMR's Gladstone Region Strategic Transport Model that was a primary base for Council's Traffic Infrastructure Planning. Consultation has also occurred with Gladstone Area Water Board (GAWB) in terms of future water demand likely on the GAWB network.	Yes		None required	Further ongoing negotiation, particularly with GAWB is recommended
<b>Planning assumptions - demand</b>	20.	The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of population and employment growth.	Yes	Workshops were held as part of the process of development of the LGIP to ensure that population and infrastructure assumptions were aligned	Yes		None required	
	21.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	Yes		Yes		None required	
	22.	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	Yes	Services catchments have been included on the relevant PFTI maps.	Yes		None required	
	23.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA.	Yes	Service catchments cover the PIA and in most cases the Defined Service Areas too.	Yes		None required	
	24.	The Asset Management Plan and Long Term Financial Forecast align with the LGIP projections of growth and demand. If not, is there a process underway to achieve this?	Yes	The LGIP and LTFF are aligned. The Council has a process in place to align the LTAMPs with the needs of the LGIP	Yes	Note: the LTFF was not further reviewed at this time. The initial 1 <sup>st</sup> compliance check included evidence of alignment and further actions being undertaken by Council to continue better alignment.	None required	
<b>Priority infrastructure area (PIA)</b>	25.	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes		None required	
	26.	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	Yes	Text References on PIA Maps have been included.	Yes		None required	
	27.	The PIA boundary shown on the PIA map is legible at a lot level and the planning scheme zoning is also shown on the map.	Yes	PIA boundary and planning scheme zoning is clearly shown in the mapping at a lot level.	Yes		None required	
	28.	The PIA includes all areas of existing urban development serviced by all relevant trunk infrastructure networks at the time the LGIP was prepared.	Yes	The PIA accommodates demand, current market conditions and known intent as advised by the	Yes	Despite some submissions questioning the extent of the PIA, it has not been adjusted to include all emerging	None required	

		29.	The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years.		development community. Additionally, the demand assumptions used for medium and high density residential have been based on the typical built form identified in the Planning scheme. The typical built form was the basis to determine the density assumption for those zones, which was based on a number of general assumptions like physical height of a storey, allowable site coverage, number of bedrooms etc.	Yes	community zones. The timeframe for the conversion of this land to urban purposes exceeds the planning horizon of the LGIP. The PIA, correctly, has been determined as that area required to accommodate 10-15 years of urban growth for which Council intends to support with trunk infrastructure. See also point 11 above.	None required	
		30.	Are there areas outside the PIA for which the planning assumptions identify urban growth within the next 10 to 15 years? If so, why have these areas been excluded from the PIA?	No	See PIA Map.	Yes	In addition to the exclusion of some emerging community zoned land, Miriam Vale is also excluded as an urban area for the purposes of the PIA – this is based on the fact that it does not contain a reticulated sewerage network. Council intends to consider infrastructure in the SOW that supports development outside the PIA in further revisions of the LGIP however as this is not required by the LGIP Guidelines at this time, Council has determined not to expand the PIA or the SOW in this regards.	None required	
		31.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	PIA was developed to reflect a least cost pattern of development, accommodate demand, current market conditions and known intent as advised by the development community.	Yes		None required	
<b>Desired standards of service (DSS)</b>		32.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes		None required	
		33.	The DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each network.	Yes	Council has identified it has sufficient land for community facilities and therefore has not identified any key planning and design standards in the DSS section for this network.	Yes	Design standards have also been included for stormwater despite the fact stormwater that trunk infrastructure is excluded from the LGIP. This provides some clarity on design standards for non-trunk infrastructure and clearly indicates this is the purpose.	None required	Small suggestion from the reviewer to slightly adjust this section of the LGIP for greater clarity

		34.	The DSS reflects the key, high level industry standards, regulatory and statutory guidelines and codes, and planning scheme policies about infrastructure.	Yes	The DSS for each network has been derived from a number of relevant industry standards, regulatory and statutory guidelines and codes, and planning scheme policies including (but not limited to) Austroads, Queensland Streets, Capricorn Municipal Design Guidelines, Water Service Association Australia - Water and Sewerage Standards, Planning Guidelines for Water Supply and Sewerage (DEWS), relevant Acts and associated regulations.	Yes	Noted that parks and land for community facilities is limited given that no new items are identified in the SOW.	None required	Some further clarification and explanation on this in the LGIP could be provided but is not essential.
		35.	There is alignment between the relevant levels of service stated in the local government's Long Term Asset Management Plan (LTAMP) and the LGIP. If not, is there a process underway to achieve this?	Yes	The DSS stated in the LGIP covers trunk infrastructure only. The service standards contained in the LTAMPs covers standards for provision of non-trunk infrastructure as well as service outcomes across existing networks.	Yes	As initially advised, the SOW was initially based on the Council Capital Works Schedules (IPPs) and then progressively reviewed as part of the early LGIP process. At that stage the reviewer noted some inconsistencies which were explained and/or reconciled. Not further review of this has occurred.		
<b>Plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) – structure and text</b>		36.	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	Template was utilised.	Yes		None required	
		37.	PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes		Yes		None required	
		38.	PFTI schedule of works summary tables for future infrastructure are included for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes	Maps show alignment of SOW and PFTIs	Yes		None required	
<b>PFTI – Maps</b> <i>[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]</i>		39.	The maps clearly identify the existing and future trunk infrastructure networks distinct from each other.	Yes	Maps clearly identify the existing and future trunk infrastructure	Yes		None required	
		40.	The service catchments referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown clearly on the maps.	Yes	Maps clearly show service catchments	Yes		None required	
		41.	Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legible map reference.	Yes	Maps clearly show Future trunk infrastructure	Yes		None required	
		42.	The infrastructure map reference is shown in the SOW model and summary schedule of works table in the LGIP.	Yes	Infrastructure Map reference is same as SOW model and summaries.	Yes		None required	
<b>Schedules of works</b> <i>[Add rows to the checklist to address these</i>		43.	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP complies with the LGIP template.	Yes	SOW was undertaken using the original version of the model (released in July 2014) with modifications to reflect later changes/corrections to	Yes		None required	

	<i>items for each of the networks]</i>			the DSDIP model.				
		44.	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.	Yes		Yes	The SOW has been reviewed previously to ensure that items identified are related to growth	None required
		45.	The existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA.	Yes		Yes	As per the previous review and discussions across Council's engineering and planning team this appears to be the case	None required
		46.	Is there alignment of the scope, estimated cost and planned timing of proposed trunk capital works contained within the Schedule of Works and the relevant inputs of the LTAMP and LTFF? If not, is there a process underway to achieve this?	Yes		Yes	As per comment at item 35 above	None required
		47.	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is consistent with legislative requirements.	Yes	The cost breakdown (including contingency and on costs) are not separately identified on the LGIP SOW		The SOW was amended to incorporate the full unit rate for Transport for relevant values and calculations to reflect the full value of the infrastructure as per the Ministerial condition. Subsequent changes to the LGIP and tables was made to ensure alignment.	
	<b>SOW model</b>	48.	The submitted SOW model is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline for LGIPs.	Yes	The SOW model is one of the earliest versions of the DSDIP model			
		49.	The SOW model has been prepared and populated consistent with the statutory guideline for LGIPs and its User manual for the SOW model.					
	<b>Extrinsic material</b>	50.	All relevant background studies and reports in relation to the preparation of the LGIP are available and identified in the list of extrinsic material in the LGIP guideline.	Yes	A detailed list of extrinsic material is available in Table 2.9	Yes		None required