

Appendix D – LGIP Checklist

2nd Review - No changes were required to the checklist as a result of compliance with state conditions and/or LGIP amendments following public submissions.

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 Planning Act 2016, Minister’s Guidelines and Rules, 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 Minister’s Guidelines and Rules	All	1.	The LGIP sections are ordered in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	All LGIP sections are ordered 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 Planning Scheme, while Schedules of Works tables and LGIP maps are located in Schedule 3.	Yes	Complies - The draft LGIP has been prepared in accordance with statutory requirements to ensure it can be compliantly inserted into the 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 within the draft LGIP document complies 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	All 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
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions (to those in the QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements.	Yes	The only additional definition is that of an Equivalent Demand Unit (EDU), which does not conflict with any definition in the QPP.	Yes	Complies – The additional definition of an Equivalent Demand Unit is not inconsistent with any definition contained within the QPP	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 – Drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the 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 draft LGIP includes the following networks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Supply Wastewater Stormwater Transport Public Parks and Land for Community Facilities DSS for the stormwater network has been provided in the document. No existing or future ‘trunk’ stormwater infrastructure has been identified throughout preparation of the LGIP, however Council wishes to ensure the capability to condition for trunk stormwater infrastructure in the future if required.	Yes	Complies – The draft LGIP trunk infrastructure networks for Water supply, Wastewater, Transport, Stormwater, and Public Parks and Land for Community Facilities It is noted that there are no PFTI or works schedules prepared for the stormwater network. This is considered acceptable, given the nature of the existing stormwater drainage arrangements (i.e. typically informal road drainage with no existing or future trunk infrastructure identified). Council has identified a desired standard of service for the stormwater network to ensure the capability to condition for trunk stormwater infrastructure is retained, should the need arise in the future.	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 drafted 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	Projection areas are identified on the PIA maps	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 Local Government Infrastructure Plan Priority Infrastructure Area Maps PIA 01 – PIA 04. These documents are contained in Schedule 3.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		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 are identified on the PFTI maps for each network	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
	Planning assumptions - methodology	11.	The population and dwelling projections reflect those prepared by the Qld Government Statistician (as available at the time of preparation).	No	The most recent QGSO population projections (2015 edition), project total population growth of between -137 to 301 (low to high series) over the 2016-2036 period. This growth rate (~15 people per year) is considered too conservative by Council, and not reflective of current growth being experienced, or anticipated growth in the banana industry and solar power industry. Council has chosen to use historical growth of estimated resident population, averaged over a 15 year period.	Yes	Complies – While Cook Shire’s population and dwelling projections do not align with those prepared by the QGSO, Integran is satisfied with the Council’s reasoning for this difference and believes it more accurately represents the growth expected to occur into the future. This approach is deemed acceptable based on the provisions of Statutory Guideline 03/14, which state that the appropriateness of QGSO projections should be carefully considered against historical growth rates and anticipated development trends for the LGA.	N/A	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	Employment and non-residential development projections have been developed based on labour force and employment statistics sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.	Yes	Complies – Employment and non-residential development projections have been based on available data from the ABS and projected in accordance with projected population growth.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		13.	The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding.	Yes	The developable area within the population modelling for the Cooktown region has been determined with consideration given to both absolute and partial constraints. These constraints include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural areas • Bushfire • Coastal hazards • Existing easements • Extractive industry • Environmental constraints • Heritage considerations • Steep Slopes Given the minimal existing and projected population anticipated outside of the Cooktown region, a broader assessment of land availability was undertaken, on the basis that the planning scheme zoning is reflective of absolute constraints to development.	Yes	Complies – The draft LGIP excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints in the Cooktown area, including but not limited to steep slopes, conservation, and flooding. The approach taken outside of Cooktown is considered reasonable, with planning scheme zoning being reflective of absolute constraints in these areas.	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 densities reflect current development trends and development allowable under the planning scheme.	Yes	Complies – 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, and previous development approvals.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	For larger development parcels, allowances have been made to account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure	Yes	Complies - Population modelling undertaken as part of the preparation of the LGIP has provided allowance for land required for local roads and other infrastructure when developing planned density rates for development in Cook shire.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		16.	The population and employment projection tables identify “ultimate development” in accordance with the QPP definition.	Yes	The projection tables identify ultimate development in accordance with the QPP definition	Yes	Complies - Determination of ultimate population and employment projections have been developed in accordance with the definition provided by QPP.	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	Remaining capacity can be determined by subtracting the figures from each projection year from the figures for 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 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 discussions with Council planners.	Yes	Complies - The planning assumptions reflect the land use pattern and provisions within the planning scheme. Within urban areas, the planning scheme provides capacity for growth which, for the purposes of the draft LGIP, is able to occur in an efficient, sequential pattern.	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. CSC officers provided documents to DTMR officers via email dated 7 th August 2017 and sought comment on the Planning Assumptions, Desired Standards of Service, Transport Catchment mapping and Transport Plans for Trunk Infrastructure.	Yes	Complies – Cook Shire Council contacted the Department of Transport and Main Roads in August 2017 to provide a copy of LGIP documents and seek comments on planning assumptions. DTMR will have further opportunity to review and comment on the LGIP during the State Interest Check process.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	Planning assumptions - demand	20.	The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of population and employment growth.	Yes	Demand projections are based on the population and employment projections	Yes	Complies – Infrastructure demand projections are expressed in ‘Equivalent Demand Units’ (EDUs) with the rates of growth in EDUs reflective of population growth. The EDU 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.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		21.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	Yes	Demand generation rates are based on typical demand generation rates	Yes	Complies – The EDU 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.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		22.	The service catchments used for	Yes	Service catchments are identified on	Yes	Complies – Service catchments for each	N/A	LGIP may proceed

		infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.		the PFTI maps for each network, and the demand tables in the LGIP document		network are identified on respective PFTI maps and cross-referenced in tables of demand, located in Schedule 3.		
	23.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA.	Yes	The service catchments cover at least the PIA.	Yes	Complies – Service catchments across all networks cover at least the PIA, representing that urban development within the PIA boundary is planned to be service by all 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	Growth projections are aligned with Council’s other long term planning documents	Yes	Complies – The projected growth and demand has been confirmed as being within a reasonable range by the finance department	N/A	LGIP may proceed
Priorty infrastructure area (PIA)	25.	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The LGIP has been prepared using 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 (Local Government Infrastructure Plan Priority Infrastructure Area Maps PIA 01 – PIA 04) 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 (PIA 01 to PIA 04) in Schedule 3. The PIA Extent Map is legible at the lot level and this map also shows planning scheme zones.	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 with all relevant trunk networks.	Yes	Complies – The PIA includes all areas of existing urban development which are serviced by all trunk infrastructure networks, in accordance with the definition of the PIA in the Planning Act 2016	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 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, the population outside the PIA is projected to decline as a greater proportion of the population is located within urban areas.	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	There is minimal growth projected outside the PIA over the next 10 to 15 years.	Yes	Complies – The PIA is sufficient to accommodate projected the urban growth forecast within the next 10 to 15 years.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	31.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The PIA reflects the extent of urban zoned land currently serviced or planned to be serviced with trunk infrastructure networks.	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	N/A	LGIP may proceed

							urban growth will occur over the next 10 to 15 years.		
Desired standards of service (DSS)	32.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The LGIP has been prepared using 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	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 refer to relevant standards.	Yes	Complies – The desired standards of service included in the LGIP and supporting documents contains key, high level industry planning and design 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	Levels of service within the LGIP and long term planning documents are the same	Yes	Complies – Council’s long term planning documents have informed the majority of infrastructure inclusions in the LGIP schedules of works. Therefore, the DSS between both documents is considered to be the same.	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	The LGIP has been prepared using LGIP template.	Yes	Complies – The drafting of the Plans for Trunk Infrastructure 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 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	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 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	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	The PFTI maps clearly distinguish the existing trunk network elements from the future trunk networks.	Yes	Complies - Assets on the PFTI maps are clearly identified, and existing and future trunk elements have been appropriately distinguished	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	40.	The service catchments referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown clearly on the maps.	Yes	The PFTI maps clearly show the service catchments in areas serviced by trunk infrastructure. Full extents of service catchments are shown on the service catchment maps.	Yes	Complies – Service catchments identified in the SOW Model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown on all PFTI maps and service catchment maps for all networks.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	41.	Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legible map reference.	Yes	All future trunk items are identified on PFTI maps.	Yes	Complies - All future trunk infrastructure components are identified on the PFTIs, including a map reference which aligns with IDs identified in the Schedule of Works model and LGIP document	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	42.	The infrastructure map reference is shown in the SOW model and summary schedule of works table 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 PFTIs, including a map reference which aligns with IDs identified in the Schedule of Works model and LGIP document	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
Schedules of works <i>[Add rows to the</i>	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	LGIP may proceed	

	<i>checklist to address these items for each of the networks]</i>	44.	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the Planning Act and Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the PA and Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	Complies – The extent of trunk infrastructure depicted on the plans represents a logical provision of trunk infrastructure and is consistent with the examples of trunk infrastructure identified in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules. Non-trunk infrastructure has been excluded.	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 infrastructure network planning has been undertaken taking into consideration demand across the entire service catchments which extend beyond the PIA.	Yes	Complies – 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.	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	Scope, cost and timing of proposed trunk infrastructure works are consistent between the LGIP and Council's long term planning documents.	Yes	Complies – Council's long term planning documents have informed the majority of infrastructure inclusions in the LGIP schedules of works, including information regarding costs. Therefore, there is good alignment of scope, cost and timing of proposed capital works between both documents.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		47.	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is consistent with legislative requirements.	Yes	Existing assets have been costed using recent asset register valuations where available, and otherwise have used a unit rate approach. All on-costs are consistent with the guideline requirements. Future assets have been costed using a combination of project costs (where available) and unit rates. On-costs and contingency values are consistent with the guideline requirements.	Yes	Complies – The costing approaches and application of on-costs/contingencies in the SoW model and schedule of works tables are consistent with legislative requirements.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
SOW model		48.	The submitted SOW model is consistent with the model included with Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	Council's consultants Integran Pty Ltd have prepared a SOW model that is consistent with the model included with the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	Complies – 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 Minister's Guidelines and Rules and the 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 Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	Complies – 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, unit rates of assets and land, demand forecasts, lists of assets and relevant catchments, charges calculations that provide transparency in	N/A	LGIP may proceed

							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.		
	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 Minister's Guideline and Rules.	Yes	The nominated extrinsic materials are identified and made available for review.	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