

City of Gold Coast - LGIP Review Checklist for stormwater quality major amendment
Part of the Minister's Guidelines and Rules

Second review - Changes were made to the following checklist responses as a result of changes made during the state review process, and compliance with state conditions (4, 7, 11, 20, 21, 24, 33, 35, 36, 41, 44, 46, 47). No amendments to the LGIP were made following public submissions.

Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) checklist		COLUMN 2 To be completed by local government		COLUMN 3 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	The draft LGIP policy document has been prepared in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies - All sections within the draft LGIP document 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 is located in Part 4 of the City Plan and the LGIP planning assumptions, schedules of work tables and LGIP maps and other extrinsic material is located in Schedule 3 as per Appendix A - Local government infrastructure plan template.	Yes	Complies - The draft LGIP has been prepared in accordance with Queensland Planning Provision requirements to ensure it can be compliantly inserted into the City of Gold Coast Planning Scheme.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		3.	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Yes	All content and text included in the draft LGIP complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies - The content and text of the draft LGIP complies with all mandatory components of the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		4.	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Yes	All cross references to paragraphs, tables and maps in Part 4 and Schedule 3 are correct.	Yes	Complies - All text references within the draft LGIP document to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	N/A	LGIP may proceed Council should ensure that the addition of the stormwater network components to the current adopted LGIP does not inadvertently result in incorrect numbering and referencing within the document (i.e. where the changes affect numbering or ordering of other network information)
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions (to those in the QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements.	Yes	There are no additional definitions included in the draft LGIP, other than those in the QPP.	Yes	Complies - No additional definitions are provided in the LGIP document.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	Preliminary section	6.	The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The Preliminary section has been prepared in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies - The drafting of the preliminary section is in accordance 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	This major amendment to LGIP proposes to add the Stormwater quality network to the initial LGIP that was implemented as Part 4 of the City Plan, commencing 27 June 2018. This LGIP consisted of the following four networks: • Transport network • Water network • Sewerage network • Public parks and land for community facilities network The Stormwater quality network will form part of a separate major amendment to the LGIP.	Yes	Complies - This major amendment LGIP document adds a stormwater quality network to the Water, Sewerage, Transport and Public parks and land for community facilities networks included in the currently adopted LGIP. It is understood that stormwater quality will be included in the LGIP at a later date.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	Planning assumptions - structure	8.	The drafting of the Planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The Planning assumptions section has been prepared in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies - The drafting of the Planning assumptions section 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	All projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the Priority Infrastructure Area and Projection Areas Maps (LGIP-PIA-0 to LGIP-PIA-17) in Schedule 3.	Yes	Complies - All projection areas listed in the tables of projections (Tables SC3-1.1, 3.1-2, 3.1-4 and 3.1-5) are shown on the Priority Infrastructure Area and Projection Areas Maps (LGIP-PIA-0 to LGIP-PIA-17). These documents are contained in Schedule 3.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	Planning assumptions - methodology	10.	All the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant PFTI maps and vice versa.	Yes	The service catchments listed in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are identified on the relevant PFTI map in Schedule 3 as follows: • Plans for trunk stormwater quality infrastructure map (LGIP-PFTI-STW-QLY) The LGIP PFTI layer will also form part of Council's online City Plan interactive mapping tool.	Yes	Complies - All service catchments listed in the tables of projected demand for each network are identified on the relevant PFTI maps for that network.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		11.	The population and dwelling projections reflect those prepared by the Old Government Statistician (as available at the time of preparation).	Yes	The population and dwelling projections in the draft LGIP are within the low and medium series of the latest 2016 State Growth Projections. OESR and DILGP were consulted on these projections and Council has received confirmation that the LGIP growth projection within this range would generally be seen as reasonable. Council will continue to refine the projections as further work on the LGIP is undertaken.	Yes	Complies - The population modelling was revised in 2013 to more closely reflect the more recently published information at the time the LGIP was prepared. The population and dwelling projections reflect those prepared by the Queensland Government Statistician (2013e) at this time, with projections generally falling between the low-medium projection ranges. The 2031 population projection is marginally below the QGSO low series projection (2013e). Comparison against the QGSO (2015e) projections (available at the time of preparation) are as follows: Population: After excluding assumed tourist population, the assumed population in the draft LGIP cohorts relate to the 2015e QGSO projections show the following: 2016 & 2021 - marginally above the 'high' QGSO projections 2026 - generally aligned with the 'medium' QGSO projections 2031 - between the 'low' and 'medium' QGSO projections Dwellings: Dwelling projections are based on a lower occupancy rate than those in the latest QGSO projections, however this reflects the fact that the state projections exclude the tourist population and non-private dwellings (e.g. hotels), which are expected to experience a higher level of vacancy than typical dwelling types	N/A	Integrates recommendations that future LGIP reviews/amendments incorporate a review and revision of the population and demand modelling, to incorporate the latest QGSO projections and outcomes of the soon to be released ABS Census 2016 data and Shaping SEQ (Regional Plan) document.
		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	Council commissioned GeoQik Pty Ltd to prepare projections of population and employment in January 2010. The process followed to prepare these projections is detailed in version 3.0 of the report titled PIP Population and Employment Projections General Report. These projections were undertaken at LUL level and were prepared using a base year of 2006 with growth projected in 2011, 2016, 2021 and 2026. The projections aligned with: • for residential development - the State Government's Planning Information and Forecasting Department (PIFD) forecasts of residential growth at the time the projections were prepared; and • for non-residential development - the employment projections contained within the SGS Economics Pty Ltd report titled Gold Coast City Council - PIP Employment Disaggregation Project.	Yes	Complies - The employment and non-residential development projections have been sourced from the SGS Economics Pty Ltd report identified in the Council response. Discussions with Council have identified that the timing of the projections within the SGS report have been shifted in the same manner as the population projections (during the 2013 population model review), in order to align with anticipated population growth.	N/A	LGIP may proceed

COLUMN 1 Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) checklist				COLUMN 2 To be completed by local government		COLUMN 3 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
		13.	The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding.	Yes	To estimate the potential development yield of each parcel in the city, it was necessary to calculate the developable area of the parcel. Developable area was calculated by subtracting from the total area of the parcel, the area subject to significant development constraints. Significant development constraints are summarised as follows: • Land identified as high landslide hazard on the Landslide Hazard Overlay maps • Waterways and wetlands (not including buffers) identified on the Environmental Significance Overlay maps • Land zoned for open space The methodology for determining the developable land area is detailed in the Extrinsic Material Report - LGIP Planning Assumptions. Developable areas are shown on the Developable Area Map (LGIP DEV-AREA).	Yes	Complies - As part of their work to develop a population model, Council have undertaken an assessment of developable area which excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints, such as environmental or conservation requirements and high landslide hazard were excluded from the developable area. Further consideration also ensured that areas not envisaged to be developed (such as rural or unzoned areas) were excluded, and areas within the Special Purpose zone which are envisaged for development (such as Gold Coast Airport and the special development areas precinct) were included within the developable area. Flooding is not considered to be an absolute constraint, so while areas within waterways and wetlands were excluded, areas subject to irregular inundation were included within the developable area.	N/A	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 density for each zone and precinct within Council's planning scheme was determined by the provisions of the planning scheme. • In residential zones, the minimum lot size provisions were a primary input for determining the number of dwellings per net hectare. • In non-residential zones, building heights and site coverage provisions were the primary inputs for calculating density. It is important to note that a planned density is an average density for the purposes of long term trunk infrastructure planning. The planned density accepts that development or redevelopment will occur on lots at higher or lower densities than the planned density, however the overall density of new development in an area is assumed to average out at the planned density.	Yes	Complies - The planned densities have been determined using the provisions within the planning scheme, and have been tempered where appropriate in order to reflect current development trends and a realistic overall level of development	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	35% was allocated to greenfield land larger than 2,400m ² to account for land requirement for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	Complies - Documentation of the population modelling revision (undertaken in 2013) identifies a 35% reduction in capacity for sites with a net developable area greater than 2400m ² , which provides sufficient land to account for provision of 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 'ultimate' development projection has been determined for population and employment projection which is generally consistent with QPP definition. It must be recognised that the concept of 'ultimate' development is a high level aspiration of the City Plan which evolves continuously to reflect community and Council expectations at a particular point in time.	Yes	Complies - Determination of an ultimate population, outlined in the extrinsic material, is 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	The remaining capacity can be determined by deducting the current level of development (as at in 2016) for a projection area from the ultimate development.	Yes	Complies - It is possible to calculate the remaining capacity to accommodate growth within each projection area by subtracting the population/dwellings during a particular cohort, from the 'ultimate' development figures for that projection area	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		18.	The planning assumptions reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The planning assumptions are based on the sequential take up of developable land and various housing products across different growth fronts within the City. Additionally, Council has also used the State Government growth projections as a guide for timing and scale of growth across the projected areas.	Yes	Complies - The planning assumptions reflect the land use pattern and provisions within the planning scheme, with the majority of development projected to occur within areas serviced (or intended to be serviced) by all relevant LGIP networks	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?	No		Yes	Complies - As this LGIP amendment does not address the Transport, Water, or Sewerage networks, the Department of Transport and Main Roads, and Gold Coast Water (as the relevant distributor-retailer) have not been consulted. Both agencies were consulted separately as part of the development of the broader LGIP document	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 are identified in the extrinsic material report as follows: • Extrinsic Material Report Stormwater Quality Network A range of demand projections have been prepared as part of the Stormwater Quality Network modelling, including: - Existing and projected 'total suspended solids' pollutant load; - Existing and projected 'total phosphorous' pollutant load; and - Existing and projected 'total nitrogen' pollutant load. These network demands have been derived using the same inputs used to inform the planning assumptions, with additional inputs required to model appropriate landuse data to assist the modelling. Total Nitrogen pollutant load controls the type and scale of the infrastructure required to achieve the DSS and forms the key demand measure for the purpose of network modelling.	Yes	Complies - Section 2.2 and 2.3 of the Stormwater Quality Network Extrinsic Material Report identify changes in land use resulting from likely development within the City, in order to accommodate assumed population growth. A peer review of the modelling has been performed to validate the methodology, models, and results to determine the level of consistency with other regionally recognised modelling processes, (i.e. Healthy Land and Water).	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		21.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	No	No demand generation rates are provided as the City has adopted a new approach to stormwater quality network planning. This was discussed with and agreed to by State. Refer to Extrinsic Material Report Stormwater Quality Network.	No	Does not comply - No demand generation rates are provided within the LGIP (identified as not applicable). The summary of the peer review of the model within the Extrinsic Material, does not discuss consistency or otherwise with industry standard demand generation rates. The methodology and inputs for predicting the future uses (which drive demand generation) have not been identified within the LGIP, nor have any metrics for generation of suspended solids, phosphorous and nitrogen. Council has broadly documented the base assumptions and processes performed in determining the stormwater pollutant load (network demand). The three key measures of pollutant load, being total suspended solids, phosphorous and nitrogen, have been modelled for both an existing (base case scenario) and predicted development outcomes (future land use) which are driven by the Planning Scheme. These measures have been derived from an assessment of the impervious areas (and other site specific factors) generated by development and the application of demand generation conversion rates for the various landuses. This approach is understood to have been part of the document that was approved by the Minister in the first state interest check, and therefore has not been re-prosecuted as part of this compliance check.	N/A	LGIP may proceed - on the basis that the Minister has endorsed the approach at first state review
		22.	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	Yes	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on the relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	Yes	Complies - Service catchments are identified on all PFTI maps and demand tables. The full extent of service catchments are shown on the PFTI index maps.	N/A	LGIP may proceed

LGIP guideline outcome	COLUMN 1 Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) checklist				COLUMN 2 To be completed by local government		COLUMN 3 To be completed by appointed reviewer			
	LGIP component	Number	Requirement	Requirement met (yes/no)	Local government comments	Compliant (yes/no)	Justification	Corrective action description	Recommendation	
Priority infrastructure area (PIA)		23.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA.	Yes	The service catchment completely contains the PIA. Refer to PIA map and PFI1 maps. Stormwater quality has 7 service catchments.	Yes	Complies - a review of the Service Catchments and PIA boundary has identified that the PIA is serviced by the stated 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 Long Term Financial Forecast is built up from 50 different services provided by Council. Many of the basic services that rely solely on general rate funding simply roll forward from the budget year using global assumptions for inflation and growth. The large services that deliver significant infrastructure (including all LGIP networks) develop detailed financial forecasts using varying growth and demand assumptions based on relevant drivers. Each of the services that deliver trunk infrastructure have included the full list of LGIP projects in their service forecasts, which has been consolidated into the corporate model. Therefore, the forecast capital program is consistent with the assumptions used in the LGIP for the delivery of trunk infrastructure. There are some minor alignment differences between the Long Term Asset Management Plan and the LGIP population and dwelling projections data. This was due to timing issues during the submission of LGIP1, where more recent growth information was available, but was not used as part of the AMP update at that time. Since then, this updated growth information has been incorporated into all AMPs.	Yes	Complies - Council has acknowledged that differences currently exist between the demand and growth assumptions that underpin the LTFF and those which inform the LGIP. This is due to the more conservative revenue forecasts which typically reflect both the historical and foreseeable growth rates for the LTFF modelling, as opposed to the LGIP projections which are more closely aligned to the State Government population and employment forecasts. Such differences are inevitable due to the varying growth outlooks (i.e. conservative versus optimistic) adopted for Local Government Regulation 2012, the Sustainable Planning Act, the SEQ Regional Planning Process and LGIP Guidelines. Council has identified the need for these inputs into the LTFF process to be reviewed during upcoming reviews to achieve better alignment with the LGIP.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
		25.	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies - The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
		26.	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	Yes	All PIA map references are correct.	Yes	Complies - All text references to PIA Maps (LGIP-PIA-0 to LGIP-PIA-17) 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 boundary is shown on the Priority Infrastructure Area and Projection Areas Maps (LGIP-PIA-0 to LGIP-PIA-17) in Schedule 2. The PIA Extent Map is legible at the Lot level and this map also shows planning scheme zones. The PIA layer will also form part of Council's online City Plan interactive mapping tool.	Yes	Complies - The PIA boundary shown on all PIA maps is legible at a lot level and the planning scheme zoning is shown on the map to assist with interpretation.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
		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 by relevant trunk infrastructure as described in the Extrinsic Material Report - Priority Infrastructure Area. Some locations between Maudsland and Coomera are included within the PIA despite not strictly meeting the definition provided under the Planning Act, which excludes Rural and Rural Residential areas. These locations have been included within the PIA as they have current approvals for Urban uses and therefore are serviced, or are planned to be serviced with trunk infrastructure.	Yes	Complies - The PIA includes all areas of existing urban development which are serviced by all relevant trunk infrastructure networks, subject to the PIA rules outlined in the Extrinsic Material - Priority Infrastructure Area report.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
		29.	The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years.	Yes	The population and employment assumption tables demonstrate that the PIA accommodates growth to at least 2026 and up to 2031.	Yes	Complies - The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years and no more than 15 years. Across the interim periods up to the LGIP planning horizon of 2031, approximately 97.5% of all new dwellings are projected to be developed inside the PIA which indicates that the PIA is sufficient to meet the minimum 10 years of growth. Given the extent of redevelopment / Infill development opportunities within the City, there will remain significant development potential within the PIA beyond the maximum 15 year horizon. Such development will not be realised within this timeframe, but must remain within the PIA given its location (i.e. within the existing urban development footprint) and proximity to services.	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? If so, why have these areas been excluded from the PIA?	Yes	Planning assumptions show some growth outside of the PIA however this is minor and would be located predominantly in minor villages which are not serviced with trunk infrastructure.	Yes	Complies - The PIA is sufficient to accommodate the urban growth forecast within the next 10 to 15 years. Some growth is forecast outside the PIA, however this is minor and not located within areas serviced by all Infrastructure Networks and therefore are to be excluded from the PIA in accordance with the Guidelines.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
		31.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The PIA supports the pattern of development by capturing the areas of most intense growth in the 10 (and 15 year) forecasts, where supported by infrastructure planning. The PIA reflects current urban areas and allows for rural residential housing choice to occur outside of the PIA boundary within the LGIP time period. Council has applied the following principles when determining its PIA, as a balance must be achieved between the following objectives: • including sufficient land inside the PIA to accommodate at least 10 years of future urban development and provide certainty for developers • ensuring that Council is able to fund and supply adequate trunk infrastructure to service the assumed urban development inside the PIA The Extrinsic Material Report - Priority Infrastructure Area contains further detail.	Yes	Complies - The PIA has been drafted to ensure that future urban growth is accommodated in an efficient and sequential pattern, reflecting logical extensions to the current urban form. The PIA boundary also pays regard to existing and proposed infrastructure capacities in order to determine where urban growth will occur over the next 10 to 15 years.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	Desired standards of service (DSS)		32.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The DSS section has been prepared in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies - The drafting of the desired standards of service 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 key planning and design standards for each network are stated in the DSS section.	Yes	Complies - The desired standards of service section states the key planning and design standards for each network. Full details of the desired standards of service are contained in extrinsic material reports for each network. The DSS section also includes text which defines trunk and non-trunk infrastructure. This is understood to have been part of the document that was approved by the Minister in the first state interest check, and therefore has not been re-prosecuted as part of this compliance check.	N/A	LGIP may proceed - on the basis that the Minister has endorsed the approach at first state review	
		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 Stormwater quality has been developed based on a number of background reports and studies. The information relied upon to develop the DSS is outlined in the extrinsic material. The standards of service presented in the LGIP aim to achieve pollutant load reductions, over and above the SPP development site requirements, in order to achieve no net worsening of catchment pollutant loads as a result of future development.	Yes	Complies - The DSS are supported by numerous background studies and reports prepared by and on behalf of Council. These reports have drawn upon common industry practices and standards to arrive at a set of DSS that supports the Council's position to achieve no net worsening of catchment pollutant loads as a result of future development.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	

LGP guideline outcome	COLUMN 1 Local government infrastructure plan (LGP) checklist				COLUMN 2 To be completed by local government		COLUMN 3 To be completed by appointed reviewer			
	LGP component	Number	Requirement	Requirement met (yes/no)	Local government comments	Compliant (yes/no)	Justification	Corrective action description	Recommendation	
		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 alignment of the growth assumptions, standards of service and SOW model between the LGIP SW Quality and the Flood Mitigation & Drainage AMP has been reviewed and the City can confirm that these are aligned, with the exception of a very minor cost difference.	Yes	Council has identified that general alignment of the LGIP and LTFF processes has been achieved with respect to the future projects / expenditure. It is therefore expected that the desired standards of service will also align between these two processes. Council has identified only minor cost differences, which will continue to be aligned during future reviews of the LTFF, LTAMP and LGIP.	N/A	LGP may proceed It is recommended that Council continue to further develop the Stormwater Quality Network Planning to more clearly identify future projects across the city to achieve the LGIP DSS. These Standards and network outcomes should be incorporated into future revisions of the LTFF / LTAMP.	
Plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) – structure and text		36.	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The PFTI section has been prepared in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies - The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template	N/A	LGP may proceed - on the basis that the Minister has endorsed the approach at first state review	
		37.	PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes	PFTI maps are identified for all nominated networks.	Yes	Complies - PFTI maps are identified in the draft LGIP document for all networks listed in the preliminary section.	N/A	LGP 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 tables are identified for all nominated networks.	Yes	Complies - PFTI schedule of works tables are included in Schedule 3 for all networks listed in the preliminary section	N/A	LGP may proceed	
PFTI – Maps		39.	The maps clearly identify the existing and future trunk infrastructure networks distinct from each other.	Yes	The PFTI maps clearly distinguish the existing trunk network elements from the future trunk networks.	Yes	Complies - Assets on the PFTI's are clearly identified, and existing and future trunk elements have been appropriately distinguished	N/A	LGP may proceed	
		40.	The service catchments referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown clearly on the maps.	Yes	The service catchments listed in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are identified on the relevant PFTI map in Schedule 3 as follows: - Plans for trunk transport infrastructure map (LGP-PFTI-STM-QLY) The LGIP PFTI layer will also form part of Council's online City Plan interactive mapping tool.	Yes	Complies - Service catchments referenced in the SOW model are identified at a Council-wide PFTI map, and catchment names and boundaries are clearly identified in the map's key.	N/A	LGP may proceed	
		41.	Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legend map	Yes	All future trunk items are identified on PFTI maps.	Yes	Complies - Future trunk infrastructure items are identified on the PFTI's, including a map reference which aligns with IDs identified in the Schedule of Works model and LGIP document	N/A	LGP may proceed	
		42.	The infrastructure map reference is shown in the SOW model and summary schedule of works tables in the LGIP	Yes	Map references are provided in the Schedule of works tables and SOW model.	Yes	Complies - All future trunk infrastructure components are identified on the PFTI's, including a map reference which aligns with ID's identified in the Schedule of Works model and LGIP document	N/A	LGP may proceed	
Schedules of works		43.	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP complies with the LGIP template.	Yes	The Schedule of works tables are consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	Complies - The schedule of works tables in the LGIP comply with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGP may proceed	
		44.	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the PA and LGIP guideline.	Yes	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the PA and LGIP guideline.	No	Does not comply - The types of trunk infrastructure depicted on the plans appears consistent with the requirements of the Planning Act and the LGIP Guideline. Definitions in the LGIP document and Extrinsic material relating to existing trunk infrastructure conflict with the infrastructure mapped on the PFTI's and included within the SoW model. This is understood to have been part of the document that was approved by the Minister in the first state interest check, and therefore has not been re-processed as part of this compliance check.	N/A	LGP may proceed - on the basis that the Minister has endorsed the approach at first state review	
		45.	The existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA.	Yes	The LGIP consists of existing and future trunk infrastructure that will have the capacity to adequately service urban growth within the PIA for next 10 - 15 years. This infrastructure has been planned at the DSS that can be funded with reference to Council's LTFF.	Yes	Complies - Trunk infrastructure in the Schedules of Works and PFTI has been identified up to the Planning horizon. This will provide infrastructure to meet the demands of urban growth up to the PIA horizon of 2031.	N/A	LGP 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	After review, the City can confirm that the scope, estimated cost and planned timing of proposed trunk capital works contained within the Schedule of Works are aligned, with the exception of a very minor cost difference.	Yes	The desired standards of service being proposed as part of this LGIP amendment for Stormwater Quality have been incorporated into the latest LTFF / LTAMP review. Council has indicated that the scope, scale and costs for Trunk Stormwater Quality Infrastructure contained within the LTFF / LTAMP are now closely aligned to the LGIP.	N/A	LGP may proceed It is recommended that Council continue to further develop the Stormwater Quality Network Planning to more clearly identify future projects across the city to achieve the LGIP DSS. These Standards and network outcomes should be incorporated into future revisions of the LTFF / LTAMP.	

COLUMN 1 Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) checklist				COLUMN 2 To be completed by local government		COLUMN 3 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
		47.	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is consistent with legislative requirements.	Yes	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP has been derived using the methodologies prescribed in the guidelines.	Yes	<p>Complies - The costs identified in the SOW Model represent the Establishment Cost of the Trunk Infrastructure valued at the base date of the LGIP (2016).</p> <p>The costs associated with the Stormwater Quality Network have been developed through application of unit rates that reflect costs associated with the proposed infrastructure.</p> <p>Overall, the costing methodologies utilise best available information, are in keeping with industry standards, and are consistent with processes identified within the legislation and statutory guidelines. The ranges for all on-costs and contingencies applied within the SOW are within the ranges identified within the Guidelines.</p> <p>Land Values have been applied using a Broad-brush approach (at SA2 level). This is consistent with the approaches identified within the LGIP Statutory Guidelines.</p> <p>The Financial Methodologies Extrinsic material provides the necessary detail and justification behind the Approaches to the determining the costs, which are summarised below.</p> <p>The future works costs include an allowance for project owners costs (e.g. PM, planning and design) of 20%.</p> <p>Future works costs include a contingency percentage of 30%.</p> <p>No contingencies have been applied to land costs.</p>	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	The SOW model is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline for LGIPs.	Yes	Complies - The SOW model is consistent with, and provides the same functionality as the model included with the statutory guideline for LGIPs. The full SoW model has been provided as part of this LGIP Amendment to ensure that appropriate analysis of the Financial Sustainability of the LGIP can be performed.	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	The SOW model has been populated in alignment with the guideline and user manual.	Yes	<p>Complies - The alternative to the State government SOW model was prepared by Integran Pty Ltd and populated by Council. The model documents all relevant input data including general inputs, 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.</p> <p>As discussed in Checklist item 47 above, the on-cost allowances and contingency amounts provided for within the SoW model are within the maximum ranges stipulated within the LGIP Statutory Guidelines.</p> <p>The financial inputs (i.e. escalation rates, Inflation rates, WACCs, etc.) are consistent with typical rates used by Local Government in the preparation of Charging Frameworks. The basis for the adopted rates have been clearly explained and justified by Council during the LGIP-review process and detailed within the Extrinsic Material to the LGIP.</p>	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	The nominated extrinsic materials are identified and available.	Yes	Complies - All key 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.	N/A	LGIP may proceed