




# SCENIC RIM

Regional Council

## Second Compliance Check of Scenic Rim Regional Councils Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP)

Prepared by: Chris Adam,  
Strategic AM Pty Ltd

Version	Date	Reviewer name and signature
Final	27/3/18	Chris Adam 

## Table of Contents

<b>1.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Scope exclusions</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Compliance check process</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Compliance check findings</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1.5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>1.6</b>	<b>Recommendations</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>1.7</b>	<b>Recommended conditions to be imposed</b> .....	<b>10</b>

## 1.1 Introduction

**Strategic AM Pty Ltd Chris Adam** has been engaged by **Scenic Rim Regional Council (SRRC)** to undertake a Second Compliance Check of its proposed Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP).

This review builds on the outcomes of the First Compliance Check which was completed on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2017.

Strategic AM Pty Ltd Chris Adam is required to:

- (1) evaluate whether a proposed LGIP or amendment complies with the requirements outlined under the *Planning Act 2016* and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules, including:
  - a. the SOW model requirements in Schedule 7 of the Guideline and Rules;
  - b. the LGIP template;
  - c. the approved form MGR5.1 – LGIP Review Checklist; and
- (2) comply with the fundamental ethical principles of integrity, objectivity, professional competence, due care and professional behaviour when reviewing the LGIP; and
- (3) provide a written statement and the completed checklist to the local government detailing the findings of the compliance check.

## 1.2 Scope exclusions

The following items are outside the scope of this review:

- A verification of the accuracy of individual inputs used in the preparation of the LGIP; and
- A review of the local government's Long Term Financial Forecast (LTFF) or Asset Management Plan (LTAMP) other than to determine the extent of their alignment with the LGIP.

## 1.3 Compliance check process

The process used for the compliance check of the LGIP has included the following:

### First Compliance Check (completed 29<sup>th</sup> October 2017)

Stage	Description
<b>Engaged</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Formally engaged by Council in May 2017</li><li>• Liaison with Council regarding data requirements (July - August 2017)</li><li>• <b>Initial meeting</b> (including data collection) undertaken on 7<sup>th</sup> August 2017 (Attendees:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Scott Turner, Planning Manager</li></ul></li></ul>

Stage	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kanan Saraiya, Senior Land Use Planner (Infrastructure)</li> <li>○ Lorna Scally, Coordinator Land Use Planning</li> <li>• Overview of documentation and comment on transitional Planning Scheme Landuse type equivalence table (7<sup>th</sup> Sept 2017)</li> <li>• Complete set of updated LGIP documentation (including latest SOW, LGIP Checklist, Extrinsic reports and mapping) provided 13<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017</li> </ul>
<b><u>Review</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal Review of the Draft LGIP commenced 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017</li> <li>• Initial comments and request for additional information – 20<sup>th</sup> October</li> <li>• Additional information (principally on alignment of the SOW and LTFF) and updated LGIP (including amendment Extrinsic Reports and select PIFTs) provided 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> October 2017.</li> </ul>
<b><u>Final report</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final report issued on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2017</li> </ul>

#### Second Compliance Check (completed 27<sup>th</sup> March 2018)

Stage	Description
<b><u>Engaged</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formally engaged by Council on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2018</li> <li>• Liaison with Council regarding scope of responses from the first state interest check and public consultation process (19<sup>th</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2018)</li> <li>• Receipt of complete set of updated LGIP documentation including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Final Draft LGIP, latest Schedule of Works (SOW), updated LGIP Checklist, Extrinsic Reports and Mapping)</li> <li>○ Correspondence with State including proposed changes to LGIP arising from conditions at first State Interest Check review.</li> <li>○ Councils response to LGIP submission.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>All data provided 19<sup>th</sup> March 2018</p>
<b><u>Review</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal Review of the Draft LGIP commenced 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2018</li> </ul>
<b><u>Final report</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft second compliance check report issued on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2018</li> <li>• Final second compliance check report issued on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2018</li> </ul>

The following local government personnel were involved in the compliance checks:

Name	Title	Date of discussion (s)	Scope of discussion
Scott Turner	Planning Manager	7th August 2017	Strategic Basis of the LGIP including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councils Planning Vision</li> <li>• Growth Projections,</li> <li>• Development of the PIA</li> <li>• Constraints etc</li> </ul>
Lorna Scally	Coordinator Land Use Planning	7th August	
Kanan Saraiya	Senior Land Use Planner (Infrastructure)	First Compliance Check:  7th August – 27th October  Second Compliance Check: 19 <sup>th</sup> March – 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2018	All aspects of the LGIP including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory document</li> <li>• Extrinsic Material's Projections</li> <li>• Development of the PIA;</li> <li>• Mapping</li> <li>• Schemes of Works</li> <li>• Alignment with the LTFF and LTAMP., etc</li> <li>• States correspondence relevant to the LGIP</li> <li>• Submission (and response) to issue raised at public consultation</li> </ul>

#### 1.4 Compliance check findings

As identified on the attached checklist, Scenic Rim Regional Council Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) is materially compliant with the Ministers Guidelines for such a document. Minor issues identified during the first review process were addressed in the draft version of the LGIP and supporting materials.

Council has provided details of discussions with State agencies (specifically DTMR and DILGIP) as well as liaison with QUU as the water service provider for the Scenic Rim Regional Council.

Minor amendments have been suggested (refer below). These are not considered to have a material impact on the intent and function of the LGIP.

**Items identified in the first Compliance Check (report of 29<sup>th</sup> October 2017)**

Initial Comments	Review Comment
<p><i>Council to continue with the process of aligning the Long-Term Asset Management plans (LTAMPs) with the LGIP</i></p>	<p>Council have adopted a pathway for alignment of the LTAMPs with the LGIP over time</p>
<p><i>Council to align Parks and Stormwater items with the LTFF (potentially by using the LGIP labels in the LTFF descriptions)</i></p>	<p>Council to consider alignment of the LGIP Parks and stormwater items with the long term Financial forecast (LTFF)</p>

**Items identified in the States First Interest Check (letter of 22 Dec 2017):**

**States comments (22 Dec 2017)**

**Councils Response (4 January 2018)**

**Review comment**

**Conditions**

1. Revise the SOW Model to:
  - Include a consistent approach for the escalation of infrastructure values and accurate cell row references
  - Include a consistent approach for the discounting infrastructure values

In the LGIP, future trunk assets were based on the 2016-17 Ten-year Capital Works Program. By the time the LGIP reached the first State Interest Review stage in October 2017, some of the future trunk infrastructure items were already delivered or contracted, and Council was able to report the true cost of infrastructure. In the SOW model, escalation and discounting values of infrastructure items that have been delivered before first State Interest Review have been deliberately changed to nullify the effect of escalation and discounting. Hence the true cost of infrastructure is reflected in the Gross Cost column. This explanation is included in the extrinsic material for Schedule of Works Model.

Therefore, deviation in escalation and discounting values for infrastructure items in those specific instances is considered relevant and as such, a consistent approach has not been applied.

Also, in a few cells under the escalation column, Council identified the cell row references that were incorrect. Escalation columns have been double checked and the accurate cell row references have been inserted in the formulae.

Ensure allocation of all park infrastructure items to respective service catchments

Council has identified a few park infrastructure items where the catchments were not allocated and this error has been rectified.

2. Ensure all documents listed as extrinsic materials are made available with the LGIP during public consultation and remove the SOW model from the list of extrinsic material

All documents listed as extrinsic material will be made available with the LGIP during public consultation. The SOW model has been removed from the list of extrinsic material.

**Further Advice**

Consider the cashflow projections provided in the SOW "... which compares future infrastructure charges revenue to expenditure.... (noting that) ... the State sets the maximum charges that a local

Councils response is considered to be consistent with its obligations

**LGIP may proceed.**

Councils response is considered to be consistent with its obligations  
**LGIP may proceed.**

government may levy for the provision of trunk infrastructure (and) where expenditure exceeds the revenue from infrastructure charges, the local government has to consider options to manage it. Any shortfall in charges revenue to cover expenditure will have to be recovered from other sources such as rates"

"... Local Governments are required to strategically consider and manage the provision and funding of trunk infrastructure in their local government area, in an efficient and financially sustainable manner. To achieve this over time, local governments are encouraged to undertake regular reviews to ensure ongoing alignment of its LGIP, AMP and LTFP"

**Other Comments**

Removing references to Rural Precincts and their minimum lot sizes

Adding a reference to existing planning schemes equivalent land uses, zones and precincts

States comments restate Councils obligations under the Ministers Guidelines.

**LGIP may proceed**

Please also note, in the extrinsic material for the Planning Assumptions under Table 3: Planned Density of Planning Assumptions Extrinsic Material for the LGIP which identifies the minimum lot size for precincts in the Rural zone, references to two of these precincts have been made in error. These have now been removed to prevent any confusion during public consultation.

"... the LGIP document, at the end of Table 1 and Table 7 editors note is inserted as "...to assist in interpretation, refer to document "Equivalent land uses, zones and precincts in the Beaudesert, Boonah and Ipswich Planning Schemes for the LGIP"

(also)  
"to assist in interpretation, refer to document "Equivalent land uses, zones and precincts in the Beaudesert, Boonah and Ipswich planning Schemes for the LGIP"

Minor administrative changes to the LGIP

**LGIP may proceed**



**Items identified at Public Consultation:**

**Community feedback**

There is the need for more footpaths/cycling tracks. I believe there should be footpaths connecting all housing developments to the town area which includes Bruckners Hill, Mt French, Hoya and Dugandan areas. I travel Hoya Road most days of the year and I, along with anyone I speak to, all agree that you take your life in your hands if you try walking on that particular road. A path would also make it much safer for cyclists. I'm also a member of a local walking group. If there are available footpaths, we can walk almost every week of the year but as most members take turns to host the group, this isn't always possible.

Development along Hoya Road seems like a sensible idea to me. Lovely high hills, certainly no flooding problems and a lot of people want to live on the north side where they have easier access to Ipswich, Brisbane, Beaudesert, Gold Coast, etc. for work or medical purposes. Hoya, Teviotville, Roadvale etc, have great sites for future rural residential. I'm also thinking ahead to when our acreage is too big for us but would still like to stay living in our present home for many years to come. Hopefully, further subdivision may be possible

**Councils Response**

The draft LGIP provides for a number of planned footpaths for Boonah community including footpaths at High Street, Railway Street, Church Street, Yeates Avenue, Highbury Street, Milford Road and Hoya Road. The draft LGIP also seeks to connect all major communities to the town centre via shared pathways on trunk roads. Infrastructure is planned, designed and supplied based on the demand and growth of a particular area

This is not a matter that (can be) addressed by the draft LGIP.

No change

No change

**Review comment**

Councils response is consistent with its powers and obligations as the planning authority for the region

**LGIP may proceed**

## **1.5 Conclusions**

The outcomes from the review suggest that Scenic Rim Regional Councils Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) is materially compliant with the requirements of the states guidelines for such a document.

## **1.6 Recommendations**

Strategic AM Pty Ltd Chris Adam recommends to the Scenic Rim Regional Council that the LGIP should proceed subject to the minor conditions identified below.

## **1.7 Recommended conditions to be imposed**

We suggest the following minor amendments be considered in the further development of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan:

- Council to continue the process of alignment of the LGIP with Council Long-Term Asset Management Plan (LTAMP); and
- Council to consider modifications to the Parks Schedule of Works to facilitate alignment with the Councils 10 Year Capital program which underpins its LGIP