

Appendix D – LGIP Checklist

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

Review principles:									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). Compliance requirements are not limited to the requirements listed in the checklist. 									
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
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	LGIP prepared using LGIP template.	Yes	The LGIP sections are ordered in accordance with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		2.	The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme.	Yes	The LGIP will be located in Part 4 of the Bundaberg Regional Council Planning Scheme 2015	Yes	The LGIP assigned to be located in Part 4 of the Bundaberg Regional Council Planning Scheme 2015	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		3.	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Yes	LGIP prepared using LGIP template.	Yes	The content and text is consistent with the mandatory components of the LGIP template	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		4.	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Yes	Complies	Yes	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions (to those in the QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements.	N/A	No additional definitions required	Yes	No definitions in conflict with statutory requirements are provided	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Preliminary section	6.	The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	LGIP prepared using LGIP template.	Yes	The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		7.	All five trunk networks included in the LGIP. If not, which networks are excluded? Why have these networks been excluded?	Yes	The LGIP includes all five trunk networks	Yes	All five trunk networks are included in the LGIP	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Planning assumptions - structure	8.	The drafting of the Planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies	Yes	The planning assumptions content and text is consistent with the LGIP template	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		9.	All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa.	Yes	LGIP projection areas are identified on the PIA map	Yes	All projection areas are shown on the PIA maps, however these are not labelled.	N/A	LGIP may proceed. Recommend that mapping be amended to include labels which identify each projection area
		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 have been included in the PFTI maps	Yes	Service catchments for all networks are identifiable from the PFTI maps. All mapped catchments are included in the infrastructure demand tables.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Planning assumptions - methodology	11.	The population and dwelling projections reflect those prepared by the Qld Government Statistician (as available at the time of preparation).	Yes	The population and dwelling projections are aligned with draft 2015 forecasts prepared by the QGSO, which were the most current and best available information at the time the modelling was undertaken. The base year for the LGIP is 2016. The estimated resident population at 2016 is 96,270, however in order to appropriately account for infrastructure demand generated by tourists, the population projections	Yes	All population projections reflect the medium series QGSO forecasts for the Local government area. The use of draft 2015 forecasts for the population and dwelling projects is considered reasonable, given the significant differences to the projections published in 2013, these were considered the best available information at the time of preparation. The approach and methodology for incorporating tourist projections in addition to resident	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

				<p>contained in the Bundaberg LGIP include tourist projections. At base year the tourist population is estimated to be 3,120 (based on Tourist Accommodation Small Area Data from the ABS), taking the total population (residents and tourists) to 99,390 in 2016.</p> <p>Resident population projections for the subsequent time periods are based on the medium series forecasts, with tourist projections increasing in line with population growth.</p> <p>Dwelling forecasts have been determined by converting population to dwellings using average household size information from QGSO and ABS. The breakdown between dwelling types has also been based on 2011 ABS census data (dwelling types and persons per dwelling based on Place of Enumeration (PEP) ABS Table B31).</p>		<p>population is reasonable particularly as the projections inform network planning that needs to account for the tourist population in Bundaberg. Council's approach for preparing the dwelling forecasts is also in keeping with standard practice of converting population to dwellings based on ABS data on average household sizes. Forecast dwellings are therefore directly correlated to population and tourist growth and account for declining household sizes over time.</p>			
		12.	<p>The employment and non-residential development projections align with the available economic development studies, other reports about employment or historical rates for the area.</p>	Yes	<p>The employment and non-residential projections are based on ABS employment and labour force data for base year projected an increase in line with population growth. Employment and floor space projections have been allocated to available non-residential land within projection areas based on an assessment of typical non-residential land uses within appropriate zones.</p>	Yes	<p>The methodology used to prepare the employment and non-residential projections uses ABS employment and labour force data to help determine the assumptions at the base date. Employment to population ratios and employee to floor space ratios are then used to prepare employment and floor space projections aligned to ABS census periods across the LGA. This is a reasonable approach in the absence of more detailed employment studies. The approach of spatially allocating employment and floor-space to non-residential land is informed by assessment of non-residential land use within appropriate zones to ensure there is a reasonable level of nexus between the projections and land use outcomes 'on the ground'.</p>	N/A	<p>LGIP may proceed.</p>
		13.	<p>The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding.</p>	Yes	<p>Projected population and employment growth have been estimated taking into account both absolute and partial constraints to development. Constraints considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airport and Aviation Facilities • Biodiversity Areas • Bushfire Hazards • Coastal Protection • Flood Hazards • Heritage and Neighbourhood Character • Infrastructure Corridors • Existing Easements 	Yes	<p>Appropriate levels of constraint have been accounted for in the developable areas and development yield assumptions. It is noted that the Planning Scheme contains other overlays (eg. acid sulfate soils), however, these typically have implications on design and management of works rather than constraining development density.</p>	NA	<p>LGIP may proceed.</p>

		14.	The planned densities reflect realistic levels and types of development having regard to the planning scheme provisions and current development trends.	Yes	The assumed densities identified in the LGIP are based on an assessment of Planning Scheme Code provisions, average allotment yields determined through review of the DCDB, previous development approvals, and discussions with Council planners. The densities used are considered realistic based on market demand in the Local government area which is considered more suitable for infrastructure planning purposes.	Yes	The planned densities reflect planning scheme provisions (e.g. minimum lot sizes for Reconfiguring a Lot, building envelopes for high density residential areas) tempered by analysis of average allotment yields and development approval data.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	20 - 30% allowance for road, open space and other infrastructure has been factored into the density calculations.	Yes	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		16.	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the QPP definition.	Yes	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the QPP definition. Based on the most current QGSO population projections, this is estimated to be at approximately 2099. The ultimate development takes into account planning scheme provisions such as development yields and land use constraints noted above.	Yes	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the QPP definition.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		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 area.	Yes	LGIP planning assumptions tables have been prepared using the format required of the LGIP template, which shows projections for each projection year and ultimate development. From this information it is possible to determine remaining capacity after each time period.	Yes	The projections have been prepared for each projection year and ultimate development. From this information it is possible to determine remaining capacity after each time period.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		18.	The planning assumptions reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The assumptions identified in the LGIP are based on an assessment of Planning Scheme Code provisions, average allotment yields determined through review of the DCDB, previous development approvals, and pre-lodgement discussions with Council planners. The application of these assumptions to the modelling reflects an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The planning assumptions reflect the planning scheme provisions and associated land use pattern, the extent of growth areas, propensity to develop, and align with QGSO forecasts.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		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	DTMR have been consulted during the preparation of the LGIP. Consultations have resulted in some variations being made to trunk Council assets which intersect with State Controlled Assets.	Yes	DTMR have been consulted on two occasions during the preparation of the LGIP: • 24 Nov 2016 - In relation to the Kalkie-Ashfield growth areas • 20 July 2017 - Remainder of transport network DTMR have acknowledged the consultation in an email sighted by Integran, including their intent to continue dialogue with Council.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

Planning assumptions - demand	20.	The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of population and employment growth.	Yes	Infrastructure demand projections have been based on the projection of population and employment growth, and are expressed in industry standard units identified within the LGIP Guideline. The demand projections have been prepared at the service catchment level and reflect generally understood and recognised demand generation rates for the respective zones and land uses.	Yes	Infrastructure demand projections are expressed in industry standard units identified within the LGIP Guideline, and are reflective of population growth. For residential development, demand units have been directly derived from population growth. For non-residential development, demand units have been determined for the respective non-residential zones using industry accepted generation rates and benchmarks for the respective networks.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	21.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	Yes	The demand projections have been prepared at the service catchment level and reflect generally understood and recognised demand generation rates for the respective zones and land uses. Where available, metered usage data has been used to compare and align with demand at base year.	Yes	The demand projections have been prepared at the service catchment level and reflect generally understood and recognised demand generation rates for the respective zones and land uses. Where available, metered usage data has been used to compare and align with demand at base year.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	22.	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	Yes	The service catchments have been identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables	Yes	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables within the SoW model and LGIP document.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	23.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA.	No	The sewer networks do not incorporate Moore Park Beach or The Hummock. Council does not intend to service these areas, however they have been included in the PIA, as they are considered to be existing urban development, and were included in the PIA for the PIP.	Yes	For the most part, the service catchments cover, at a minimum, the PIA. The two significant exceptions to this are areas of Moore Park Beach and The Hummock. In both instances, Council does not intend to provide sewer service to these areas, however they have been included in the PIA, in accordance with the LGIP guidelines, on the basis that they are existing urban development, and are serviced by relevant trunk infrastructure networks	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	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 growth assumptions used to underpin the LGIP and LTAMP/LTFF are similar. The alignment of growth and demand projections is in part demonstrated through the use of comparable projections for revenues and contributed trunk assets over the capital works horizon. It is noted that better alignment of Forecast expenditure over the later years of the LTFF and Capital Works Planning will be sought through future reviews of both the LGIP and LTFF processes.	Yes	Given that the two documents are produced for different purposes, the slight difference between the underlying assumptions in each is typical. The alignment of future works schedules, timings and costs demonstrates a degree of alignment between growth and demand projections. Comparison of projected revenues and contributed assets also shows general alignment. Council has identified issues with alignment in the later projection years (5 – 10 years) and is seeking to achieve better alignment through future reviews.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
Priority infrastructure	25.	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies	Yes	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

area (PIA)	26.	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	Yes	Complies	Yes	Text references to the PIA maps in the LGIP document are correct	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	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	The PIA maps are legible at a lot level, and include planning scheme zoning	Yes	The PIA maps show the PIA boundary, legible at a lot level, and include the planning scheme zoning	N/A	LGIP may proceed. Recommend that Planning Scheme zoning be added to the online mapping service as an administrative layer
	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 includes all areas of existing urban development serviced with all relevant trunk networks.	Yes	<p>The PIA includes all areas of existing urban development serviced with all relevant trunk networks.</p> <p>It should be noted that areas of Moore Park Beach and The Hummock have been included in the PIA, but are not serviced by the sewer network. These have been included on the basis that they are existing urban development (zones include Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Local Centre). Council currently has no intent to retrospectively service these areas with sewer, and therefore this is not considered to be a relevant network.</p> <p>Small existing areas of land zoned low density residential are located outside the PIA (Gin Gin, Burnett Heads), however these are not considered to be existing urban development. These properties are not serviced, and these are not anticipated to experience further development within the 15 year PIA period.</p> <p>Other large parcels of land zoned low density residential located outside the PIA (Gin Gin, Woodgate) are not existing urban development, and are not expected to develop within the 15 year PIA period.</p>	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	29.	The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years.	Yes	The PIA accommodates 15 years urban growth (from date of LGIP adoption in 2018) taking into account realistic take-up of development in infill areas.	Yes	The PIA has sufficient capacity to accommodate growth until 2031. We consider this to be consistent with the Guidelines, as this will allow for between 10 - 15 years growth from the expected date of adoption (mid 2018). In assessing the capacity of the PIA to 2031 Council has taken into consideration a realistic utilisation of capacity of infill urban areas during this time and has demonstrated that there is still sufficient capacity.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	30.	Are there areas outside the PIA for which the planning assumptions identify urban growth within the next 10 to 15 years?	Yes	Some growth is expected to be accommodated outside the PIA within the next 10-15 years. This is occurring as the result of current/pending	Yes	It has been noted that there is some urban growth expected to be accommodated outside the PIA within the next 10-15 years. In particular,	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

		If so, why have these areas been excluded from the PIA?		development approvals which are inconsistent with Council's identified development sequencing. Should the developments fail to proceed as per the current applications/approvals, Council does not intend to accommodate urban growth in these areas within the next 10-15 years.		existing/pending approvals which are not consistent with Council's identified development sequencing. Council's approach to focus the provision of all urban services in areas contained in the PIA is reasonable, as should the current/pending approvals not proceed, Council would be obliged to provide the full suite of urban services to these areas, which may be inefficient for Council to provide during this PIA period.		
	31.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The PIA reflects the extent of serviced urban land containing relevant urban services and approved development. This will assist in achieving an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	While growth is projected to occur outside the PIA, the PIA focusses on serviced urban zoned land only. This will help to achieve efficiencies in infrastructure provision by encouraging the logical extension to the current urban form.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
Desired standards of service (DSS)	32.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies	Yes	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	33.	The DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each network.	Yes	The DSS identifies the relevant standards for each network	Yes	The drafting of the DSS section includes the key planning and design standards for each network	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	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 criteria is based on various relevant industry standards, guidelines and codes as well as planning scheme policies	Yes	The DSS section identifies design criteria in accordance with a number of relevant industry standards, in addition to Council's planning scheme policies/standards.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	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 desired standards of service included in the LGIP are the same standards that are used to inform Council's LTAMP requirements	Yes	The levels of service between long term planning documents aligns.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
Plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) – structure and text	36.	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies	Yes	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	37.	PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes	PFTI maps have been produced for all LGIP networks	Yes	PFTI maps have been provided for all networks included in the LGIP	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	38.	PFTI schedule of works summary tables for future infrastructure are included for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes	Schedule of works summary tables have been prepared for all LGIP networks	Yes	Schedule of works summary tables have been provided for all LGIP networks in Schedule 3	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
PFTI – Maps <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	PFTI maps identify existing and future infrastructure as distinct from each other	Yes	Existing and future trunk infrastructure has been thematically mapped to enable distinction between the two		
	40.	The service catchments referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown clearly on the maps.	Yes	The service catchments for each network have been identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables	Yes	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on PFTI maps for each network, and demand tables within the SoW model and LGIP document.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	41.	Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legible	Yes	All future trunk infrastructure components have been identified and labelled on the PFTI maps	Yes	Future trunk infrastructure components have been identified on the PFTI mapping	N/A	LGIP may proceed

		map reference.						
		42. The infrastructure map reference is shown in the SOW model and summary schedule of works table in the LGIP.	Yes	All future trunk infrastructure components are listed in the SoW model, and summary table in the LGIP document	Yes	Future trunk infrastructure components align with the project ID's in the SoW model and schedules within the LGIP document Some labels missing from the pdf versions of the mapping, however all asset labels are visible through Council's online mapping service, which we understand will be made available for public consultation.	N/A	LGIP may proceed on the basis that online mapping will be made available as part of public consultation.
Schedules of works <i>[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]</i>		43. The schedule of works tables in the LGIP complies with the LGIP template.	Yes	The schedule of works table in the LGIP comply with the LGIP template	Yes	The schedule of works table in the LGIP are in accordance with the LGIP template. An additional column has been provided to assist in identification of assets between the LGIP document and the Schedule of Works model.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		44. The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.	Yes	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline	Yes	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		45. The existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA.	Yes	The identified infrastructure has been planned to service, at a minimum, the area of the PIA	Yes	The planning process has been undertaken to service at least the area of the PIA. It should be noted that this excludes the areas of existing urban development which Council does not intend to service with the sewer network (Moore Park Beach, The Hummock)	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		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	The scope, cost and timing of proposed capital works within the LGIP are aligned to those of the LTFF. The detailed 3 year works program within the LTFF has been used from an early stage to inform the Schedule of Works in the LGIP. Issues arise when comparing the two documents, as the LTFF includes not only capital trunk works, but also non-trunk works and asset renewals. Throughout the LGIP preparation process, Council has recognised the need to improve the detail/reporting within the LTFF to enable simpler 'like-for-like' comparisons in the future. The extraction of the LGIP (i.e. trunk) expenditures from the LTFF was difficult to perform given the way in which projects are currently aggregated and reported. It is therefore difficult to accurately gauge the value of trunk versus non-trunk future capital works used in the assessment of alignment.	Yes	The proposed scope, cost and timing of trunk works within the LGIP is generally aligned to those within Council's long-term planning documents. Over the first 5 years, good alignment is achieved over all networks, with only minor discrepancies arising in the stormwater and Sewerage networks beyond this point. Council has identified issues with alignment in the later projection years (5 – 10 years) and is seeking to achieve better alignment through future reviews through better reporting and identification of specific future project	N/A	LGIP may proceed

				As identified in response item 24, better alignment of expenditures in the later years of the LTFF and Capital Works Planning will be sought through future reviews of both the LGIP and LTFF processes.					
		47.	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is consistent with legislative requirements.	Yes	Existing costs have been predominantly sourced from Councils asset register. Future costs have been determined using a combination of unit rates and project cost information.	Yes	The cost of trunk infrastructure within the SoW model is consistent with the requirements of the LGIP guideline and SoW user manual. On-costs and contingency amounts are within the limits identified in the SoW user manual	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	SOW model	48.	The submitted SOW model is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline for LGIPs.	Yes	Council's consultants Integran Pty Ltd have prepared a SOW model that is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline.	Yes	The alternative to the State government SOW model prepared by Integran Pty Ltd includes the same functionally as the State's version. The model documents all input data including general inputs, unit rates of assets and land, demand forecasts, lists of assets and relevant catchments, charges calculations that provide transparency in the cost apportionment and derivation of charges, fully functional DCF calculations, and the required outputs including full schedules of works and summary cash flow projections.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		49.	The SOW model has been prepared and populated consistent with the statutory guideline for LGIPs and its User manual for the SOW model.	Yes	Council's consultants Integran Pty Ltd have prepared and populated a SOW model that is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline.	Yes	The alternative to the State government SOW model was prepared and populated by Integran Pty Ltd. The model documents all input data including general inputs, costs of assets and land, demand forecasts, lists of assets and relevant catchments, charges calculations that provide transparency in the cost apportionment and derivation of charges, fully functional DCF calculations, and the required outputs including full schedules of works and summary cash flow projections.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	Extrinsic material	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	All relevant background studies and reports in relation to the LGIP preparation have been provided as extrinsic material	Yes	Background studies and reports which have informed the preparation of the LGIP have been provided and listed in the LGIP document extrinsic material	N/A	LGIP may proceed