LGIP review checklist

Approved form MGR5.1 under the Planning Act 2016

Second Compliance Check

Review principles:

- A reference in the checklist to the LGIP is taken to include a relevant reference to the *Planning Act 2016* and chapter 5 of the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.
- Terms in this checklist that are defined in the *Planning Act 2016* or the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.

The checklist must not be taken to cover all requirements of the *Planning Act 2016* and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules. Local governments must still have regard to the requirements as set out in the *Planning Act 2016* and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules when preparing or amending an LGIP.

Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) checklist				**To be completed by local government**		**To be completed by appointed reviewer**			
LGIP outcome	**LGIP component**	**No**	**Requirement**	**Requirement met (yes/no)**	**Local government comments**	**Compliant (yes/no)**	**Justification**	**Corrective action description**	**Recommendation**
The LGIP is consistent with the legislation for LGIPs and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules	**All**	1.	The LGIP sections are ordered in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	LGIP is drafted according to Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) and the Guidance for the MGR, July 2017 version. All sections of LGIP are in accordance with the template and no modifications are undertaken.	Yes	Structure of the draft Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) aligns with the States template		LGIP may proceed
		2.	The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme.	Yes	LGIP will replace PIPs in the existing planning schemes of Beaudesert, Boonah & Ipswich. In the draft Scenic Rim Planning Scheme, LGIP will be Part 4 and mapping and supporting material will form Schedule 3 under Planning Act compliant scheme.	Yes	Location of the LGIP in section 4 of the Planning Scheme is consistent with the format of the Queensland Planning provisions		LGIP may proceed
		3.	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Yes	LGIP template from the Guidance for the MGR, July 2017 version is used.	Yes	Content generally complies with the mandatory elements of the LGIP template		LGIP may proceed
		4.	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Yes		Yes			LGIP may proceed
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions do not conflict with statutory requirements.	Yes	No additional definitions are inserted.	Yes	No additional definitions are included in the LGIP		LGIP may proceed
	Preliminary section	6.	The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes			LGIP may proceed
		7.	All five trunk networks are included in the LGIP. (If not, which of the networks are excluded and why have they been excluded?)	No	Scenic Rim Regional Council does not control water and wastewater network hence only three networks are included.	Yes	Water Services (potable supply and wastewater collection/treatment) are provided by Queensland Urban Utilities (QUU). QUUs requirements are outlined in its Water Netserv Plan. This is identified in the text through a footnote to section 4.1 (3) d) which states that "Water supply and sewerage trunk network information is outlined in Queensland Urban Utilities' (QUU) Water Netserv Plan which can be accessed at www.urbanutilities.com.au."		LGIP may proceed
	Planning assumptions - structure	8.	The drafting of the Planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes	The drafting of the Planning Assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template. The LGIP development categories, types and land uses have been stated as per the (Draft) Scenic Rim Planning Scheme. As an interim measure (i.e. until the SRRC Planning Scheme takes effect), SRRC has also provided supporting		LGIP may proceed

							information which identifies the relationship between SRRC land use types and those used in the Planning Schemes for Beaudesert, Boonah and Ipswich Schemes.		
		9.	All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa.	Yes		Yes	PIAs have been defined as the areas where growth is anticipated and for which all five (5) trunk infrastructure networks are provided. The rationale for determining the PIA is explained in the Councils "Planning Assumptions Extrinsic Material" report of October 2017 The projection areas identified in Tables 4.5, 4.6 4.8 and 4.9 are clearly identified on the relevant PIA maps.		LGIP may proceed
		10.	All the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) maps and vice versa.	Yes		Yes	Service catchments for each of the relevant trunk infrastructure networks are identifiable using colour coding on the PIFTI Maps.		LGIP may proceed
	Planning assumptions - methodology	11.	The population and dwelling projections are based on those prepared by the Queensland Government Statistician (as available at the time of preparation) and refined to reflect development trends in the local government area.	Yes	The population and dwelling projections are based on the Queensland Government Population Projection 2015 edition and refined to reflect more recent information.	Yes	Councils accompanying "Planning Assumptions Extrinsic Material" report of Oct 2017 provides the rationale for calculating the population and employment projections using both a "top down" approach (incorporating QGSOs latest information for population/dwellings and NEIR/Qld Treasury's regional employment projections) and a "bottom up" approach considering allocation at the local level.		LGIP may proceed
		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	The employment and non-residential development projections are partly sourced from the Department of Transport and Main Roads data on jobs. Gross floor area requirements were based on the industry standards and survey using open data sources.	Yes			LGIP may proceed
		13.	The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding.	Yes	Constraints were applied using the open datasets available in 2014 including but not limited to steep slopes, landslide hazard, bushfire, flooding and environmentally significant areas.	Yes	Developable area maps refenced in Section SC 3.2 of the LGIP clearly identify constraints.		LGIP may proceed
		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 reflect planning scheme precincts and minimum lot size overlay to project achievable and realistic levels of development.	Yes	Planned density projections reflect local conditions and are broadly consistent with figures applied by other regional LGAs.		LGIP may proceed
		15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	A broad assumption of 30% is factored into the planned densities to account for land for infrastructure.	Yes			LGIP may proceed
		16.	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the defined term.	Yes	The population and employment projection models are formulated to calculate ultimate development and accordingly reflected in the tables in Schedule 3.	Yes	Ultimate development has been determined using the Urban Footprint defined in the Planning Scheme and planned densities applicable across the region. Council has outlined its rationale for calculation of the ultimate dwelling, occupancy rates and population as well as non-residential Gross Floor Area (GFA) and employment.		LGIP may proceed
		17.	Based on the information in the projection tables and other available material, it is possible to verify the	Yes	Projection tables have existing and future capacity listed for each of the projection area and LGIP	Yes	The projection tables clearly identify Councils expected growth within the PIA areas as well as growth outside the		LGIP may proceed

			remaining capacity to accommodate growth, for each projection area.		development type to show the remaining capacity at various time periods and ultimately available.		15-year horizon (which is identifiable from the “ultimate” projections)		
		18.	The determination of planning assumptions about the type, scale, timing and location of development, reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	Scenic Rim's Population and Development Model have created a pattern of development while taking care of assumptions - type, scale, timing and location. More details can be found in the Planning Assumptions - Extrinsic Material for LGIP.	Yes	Councils rationale for developing a PIA that prescribes a sustainable pattern of development is outlined in its “Planning Assumptions Extrinsic Report”, Oct 2017		LGIP may proceed
		19.	The relevant state agency for transport matters and the distributor-retailer responsible for providing water and wastewater services for the area (if applicable), has been consulted in the preparation of the LGIP (What was the outcome of the consultation?)	Yes	Department of Transport and Main Roads and Queensland Urban Utilities were consulted on 11 August 2017 on the draft LGIP and their comments were considered and included as applicable.	Yes	Documented evidence of engagement has been provided		LGIP may proceed
	Planning assumptions - demand	20.	The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of population and employment growth.	Yes	The projections of population and employment are converted into projections of infrastructure demand as it provides a consistent basis for planning of the trunk infrastructure network. More information in included in the extrinsic material.	Yes	There is a consistent link between the planned demand assumptions contained in the LGIP and infrastructure demand projections. This link is outlined in Councils “Infrastructure Planning – Extrinsic Material “, Sept 2017.		LGIP may proceed
		21.	The infrastructure units of demand align with those identified in the Minister’s Guidelines and Rules, or where alternative demand units are used, their numerical relationship to the standard units of demand is identified and explained.	Yes	The infrastructure units of demand are as per Minister's Guidelines and Rules: • Transport - Vehicle trip ends/ day • Stormwater - Impervious Hectare/ developable area • Parks & community - Hectares/ 1000 persons	Yes	Infrastructure units of demand applied in the LGIP are consistent with those identified in the Minister’s Guidelines and Rules.		LGIP may proceed
		22.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	Yes	Demand generation rates align with the industry and design standards.	Yes	Demand generation rates (transport 7-8 trips/dwelling; Imp Ha and parks (4.4ha/1000 persons)) are consistent with accepted standards		LGIP may proceed
		23.	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	Yes	Each of the service catchments used for three infrastructure networks are represented on the PFTI maps and demand tables clearly.	Yes	Service catchments for each trunk infrastructure types are identifiable using colour coding on the PIFTIs		LGIP may proceed
		24.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the urban areas, and enable urban development costs to be compared.	Yes	As Scenic Rim is regional area, each of the service catchments includes key towns of the region.	Yes			LGIP may proceed
		25.	The asset management plan (AMP) and Long Term Financial Forecast (LTFF) align with the LGIP projections of growth and demand. (If not, what process is underway to achieve this?)	No	Existing asset management plans (AMP's) are not currently aligned with the LGIP projections. Council's current Asset Management Strategy (2014-2018) includes the following task within the Asset Management System Improvement Program: **Goals** / **Objectives** / **Tasks** Effective AM is an integral part of how we do business / Integrate AM across Council / - Align AMPs, LTFF and LGIPs The Asset Management Steering Committee has tasked the Asset Management Working Group	Yes	Councils proposed process for alignment of the LGIP and the LTAMP are consistent with the requirements the Ministerial Guidelines for this item Councils LGIP and LTFF align well for transportation, footpaths and bridges. There is a broad alignment of the LTFF with the Stormwater and Parks elements of the LGIP.	*Council to continue with the process of aligning the LTAMPs with the LGIP* *Council to align the Parks and Stormwater items with the LTFF (potentially by using the LGIP labels in the LTFF descriptions)*	LGIP may proceed

					(AMWG) with the ongoing implementation of the AM System Improvement Plan, via Council's Operational Plan. In future iterations of the AMP's the growth and demand for trunk infrastructure projections indicated within the Demand Management chapter will be aligned with the LGIP.					
	Priority infrastructure area (PIA)	26.	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes	The draft LGIP is consistent with the states template		LGIP may proceed
		27.	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	Yes		Yes	Map references (form the text to Scheme item SC 3.2) are consistent		LGIP may proceed
		28.	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 for legible lot level boundary No for planning scheme zoning	PIA boundary is legibly shown at a lot level. Though planning scheme zoning is not shown on the LGIP maps, as linking LGIP maps to planning scheme information will create unnecessary subsequent amendments when either of them is amended. Secondly, it will be repetition of information.	Yes	The PIA is shown in a series of maps which facilitate identification at the lot level. The planning scheme zoning is not included in the PIA maps. However, this is not considered to have a material impact on the functioning of the LGIP as detailed zone mapping is contained within the broader Planning Scheme(s).		LGIP may proceed
		29.	The PIA includes all areas of existing urban development serviced by all relevant trunk infrastructure networks at the time the LGIP was prepared.	Yes	Five key towns are included in priority infrastructure areas based on the availability of existing infrastructure. More information can be found in Planning Assumptions - Extrinsic Material for LGIP.	Yes	The PIA includes all areas which have been identified as having growth potential and which are currently serviced by trunk infrastructure. Councils process for determining the PIA is outlined in its Planning Assumption – Extrinsic Material Report (Oct 2017)		LGIP may proceed
		30.	The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years.	Yes	PIA boundaries are derived to accommodate growth for 10 to 15 years.	Yes	Information contained within the Extrinsic materials demonstrate that the PIA includes sufficient greenfield and infill capacity to accommodate projected growth over a 15-year planning horizon		LGIP may proceed
		31.	If there is an area outside the PIA that the planning assumptions show is needed for urban growth in the next 10 to 15 years, why has the area been excluded from the PIA?	No	There are five towns included in the priority infrastructure areas which have sufficient land available for growth in the next 10 to 15 years.	Councils response is compliant - refer Q 28			
		32.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	All PIAs are surrounding existing town centres and it follows the sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The PIA aligns with the settlement pattern prescribed in the Planning Scheme and has been developed as a least cost probable pathway for growth.		LGIP may proceed
	Desired standards of service (DSS)	33.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes	The DSS includes both qualitative and quantitative design criteria for all networks covered under the LGIP. The quantitively criteria is typically referenced to a relevant Planning Scheme Policy and/or industry standard		LGIP may proceed
		34.	The DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each network.	Yes		Yes			LGIP may proceed
		35.	The DSS reflects the key, high level industry standards, regulations and codes, and planning scheme policies about infrastructure.	Yes	DSS are highly reliant on the planning scheme policy on Infrastructure and is referenced in the LGIP.	Yes			LGIP may proceed
		36.	There is alignment between the relevant levels of service stated in the local government's AMP and the LGIP. (If not, what process is underway to achieve this?)	No	Existing asset management plans (AMP's) are not aligned with the LGIP levels of service for trunk infrastructure, as these plans do not currently categorise assets as trunk/non-trunk.	Yes	Councils proposal to align the LTAMP to the LGIP is consistent with its obligations.		LGIP may proceed

					Council's current Asset Management Strategy (2014-2018) includes the following task within the Asset Management System Improvement Program: **Goals** / **Objectives** / **Tasks** Effective AM is an integral part of how we do business / Integrate AM across Council / - Align AMPs, LTFF and LGIPs The Asset Management Steering Committee has tasked the Asset Management Working Group (AMWG) with the ongoing implementation of the AM System Improvement Plan, via Council's Operational Plan. In future iterations of the AMP's the technical and community levels of service will, where appropriate, be aligned with the LGIP and will include any variation in LOS for trunk infrastructure.				
Plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) – structure and text	37.	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes			LGIP may proceed
	38.	PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes		Yes	PFTI Maps clearly identify service catchments using colour coding and proposed infrastructure items		LGIP may proceed
	39.	PFTI schedule of works summary tables for future infrastructure are included for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes	PFTI Schedule of Works summary tables are derived from the Schedule of Works Model and are included in the Schedule 3.2 for all three infrastructure networks.	Yes	Works contained in the SOIW Tables are identifiable on the PIFTI maps. Minor misalignments have been addressed as part of the review process.		LGIP may proceed
PFTI – Maps *[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]*	40.	The maps clearly differentiate between existing and future trunk infrastructure networks.	Yes	PFTI maps use different colours and symbols to differentiate between existing and future trunk infrastructure networks.	Yes			LGIP may proceed
	41.	The service catchments referenced in the schedule of works (SOW) model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown clearly on the maps.	Yes	Different background colours are used to show service catchments for various infrastructure networks.	Yes	Different service catchments are identifiable on the PIFTIS through the application of colour coding		LGIP may proceed
	42.	Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legible map reference.	Yes	Future trunk infrastructure components are labelled at project level uniquely and legibly referenced.	Yes	Works contained in the SOIW Tables are identifiable on the PIFTI maps Minor misalignments have been addressed as part of the review process.		LGIP may proceed
	43.	The infrastructure map reference is shown in the SOW model and summary schedule of works table in the LGIP.	Yes	This map reference can be identified in LGIP tables, SOW model and PFTI maps.	Yes			LGIP may proceed
Schedules of works *[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]*	44.	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP comply with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes	Council has adopted the LGIP template format		LGIP may proceed
	45.	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the *Planning Act 2016* and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	Catchment demand analysis is undertaken to identify required trunk infrastructure and is consistent with the Act and Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	Refer extrinsic material for support		LGIP may proceed
	46.	The existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA.	Yes	In the Summary Cost Schedule, it is visible that trunk infrastructure is sufficient to service the PIA.	Yes			LGIP may proceed
	47.	Future urban areas outside the PIA and the demand that will be generated at ultimate development for the relevant network catchments have been considered when determining the trunk infrastructure included in the SOW model.	Yes	As the infrastructure network is open and connected network, future trunk infrastructure that is affected by PIA are planned for growth and included in the SOW model. Though network demand is planned for year 2031.	Yes	Service catchments for some trunk infrastructure extend beyond PIA as appropriate		LGIP may proceed

		48.	There is alignment of the scope, estimated cost and planned timing of proposed trunk capital works contained in the SOW model and the relevant inputs of the AMP and LTFF. (If not, what process is underway to achieve this?)	Yes	Proposed trunk capital works included in the SOW model is influenced by the Ten Years Capital Works Program, which is also used to inform LTFF. While Capital Works Program are derived with the help of AMP. Hence AMP, LTFF and SOW model are linked for proposed trunk capital works.	Yes	Councils proposed process for alignment of the LGIP and the LTAMP are consistent with the requirements of the Ministerial Guidelines for this item Councils LGIP and LTFF align well for transportation, footpaths and bridges. There is a broad alignment of the LTFF with the Stormwater and Parks elements of the LGIP.	*Council to continue with the process of aligning the LTAMPs with the LGIP* *Council to align the Parks and Stormwater items with the LTFF (potentially by using the LGIP labels in the LTFF descriptions)*	LGIP may proceed
		49.	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of work tables is consistent with legislative requirements.	Yes	Minister's Guidelines and Rules are followed in populating SOW model and have remain consistent in costing of trunk infrastructure in the model and the SOW tables in the LGIP.	Yes			LGIP may proceed
	SOW model	50.	The submitted SOW model is consistent with the SOW model included in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	SOW Model version of February 2016 is used.	Yes	Council has applied the current version of Schedule of Works (SOW) Model.		LGIP may proceed
		51.	The SOW model has been prepared and populated consistent with the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	Changes made are in charge collection and reflecting true cost of infrastructure where it is constructed during LGIP drafting process. Based on historic data 100% charge collection is unachievable.	Yes			LGIP may proceed
		52.	Project owner's cost and contingency values in the SOW model do not exceed the ranges outlined in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	No variance is made to contingency values in the SOW model.	Yes	Council has applied the current version of SOW Model. Contingencies and owner cost estimates are generally accepted at the states default percentages.		LGIP may proceed
		53.	Infrastructure items included in the SOW model, SOW tables and the PFTI maps are consistent.	Yes	Consistency is ensured in listing infrastructure items in SOW model, SOW tables and the PFTI maps.	Yes	Minor misalignments have been addressed as part of the review process.		LGIP may proceed
	Extrinsic material	54.	All relevant material including background studies, reports and supporting information that informed the preparation of the proposed LGIP is available and identified in the list of extrinsic material.	Yes		Yes	Council has identified its key extrinsic reference materials. Primary references are Councils own reports on Planning and Infrastructure Assumptions which specifically address the requirements for development of an LGIP		LGIP may proceed
		55.	The extrinsic material explains the methodology and inter-relationships between the components and assumptions of the LGIP.	Yes	Individual extrinsic material is created to specify assumptions made for each components of LGIP.	Yes			LGIP may proceed