

Appendix D – LGIP Checklist – Preliminary (Non-statutory) assessment

LGIP interim amendment as at 18.11.19

Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) checklist				To be completed by local government	
LGIP guideline outcome	LGIP component	Number	Requirement	Requirement met (yes/no)	Local government comments
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.	Y	As per LGIP 2017
		2.	The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme.	Y	As per LGIP 2017
		3.	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Y	As per LGIP 2017
		4.	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Y	As per LGIP 2017
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions (to those in the QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements.	Y	As per LGIP 2017
	Preliminary section	6.	The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Y	As per LGIP 2017
		7.	All five trunk networks included in the LGIP. If not, which networks are excluded? Why have these networks been excluded?	Y	Stormwater and PT are omitted, consistent with LGIP 2017
	Planning assumptions - structure	8.	The drafting of the Planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template.	y	As per LGIP 2017
		9.	All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa.	y	As per LGIP 2017
		10.	All the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant PFTI maps and vice versa.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	Planning assumptions - methodology	11.	The population and dwelling projections reflect those prepared by the Qld Government Statistician (as available at the time of preparation).	y	The population projections are as per Irwin (2018) Growth moderation for LGIP interim amendment (2019), and are comparable to the 2018 ed. projections offered by the QGSO (see email from G. Heyden, QGSO, 1.8.18)
		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.	y	the projections simply moderate those of the LGIP 2017 in proportion to the LGA population forecast.
		13.	The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding.	y	As per LGIP 2017
		14.	The planned densities reflect realistic levels and types of development having regard to the planning scheme provisions and current development trends.	y	As per LGIP 2017
		15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	y	As per LGIP 2017
		16.	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the QPP definition.	y	As per LGIP 2017

	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.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	18.	The planning assumptions reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	y	As per LGIP 2017, noting the moderation of growth has allowed for growth outside the PIA in accordance with development approvals for Sanctum West, Wingate, Willowbend, Mt Margaret, etc.
	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?	y	DTMR were invited to comment on the interim amendment on 9.1.19, and a meeting held with them on 22.1.19. No written response was forthcoming, however a response to an earlier draft amendment was received on 4.12.18.
Planning assumptions - demand	20.	The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of population and employment growth.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	21.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	22.	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	23.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA.	y	As per LGIP 2017. The planned service catchments are the same as LGIP 2017.
	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?	y	Refer to Irwin (2019) LGIP - interim amendment 2019 explanatory note.
Priority infrastructure area (PIA)	25.	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	26.	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	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.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	28.	The PIA includes all areas of existing urban development serviced by all relevant trunk infrastructure networks at the time the LGIP was prepared.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	29.	The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years.	y	It accomodates growth to at least 2031

	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?	y	Approved out-of-sequence developments such as Sanctum West, Riverstone (Wingate) and Willowbend represent urban development (some only just starting) outside the PIA. These are still not in urban zoned land and are subject to infrastructure agreements which pick up their infrastructure planning. The LGIP then plans for the reduced demand (marginally) within the PIA.
	31.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	y	Sequence tends to be as per LGIP 2017, subject to growth slow down.
Desired standards of service (DSS)	32.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	33.	The DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each network.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	34.	The DSS reflects the key, high level industry standards, regulatory and statutory guidelines and codes, and planning scheme policies about infrastructure.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	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?	y	Refer to Irwin (2019) LGIP - interim amendment 2019 explanatory note.
Plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) – structure and text	36.	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	37.	PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	38.	PFTI schedule of works summary tables for future infrastructure are included for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	y	As per LGIP 2017
PFTI – Maps	39.	The maps clearly identify the existing and future trunk infrastructure networks distinct from each other.	y	As per LGIP 2017. Noting some unavoidable overlap occurs - in which case the 'future' works items take precedence. It can still be seen from the schedule of works if an upgrade occurs.
	40.	The service catchments referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown clearly on the maps.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	41.	Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legible map reference.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	42.	The infrastructure map reference is shown in the SOW model and summary schedule of works table in the LGIP.	y	As per LGIP 2017
Schedules of works	43.	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP complies with the LGIP template.	y	As per LGIP 2017
<i>[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]</i>	44.	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	45.	The existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA.	y	As per LGIP 2017

	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?	y	Refer to Irwin (2019) LGIP - interim amendment 2019 explanatory note.
		If not, is there a process underway to achieve this?		
	47.	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is consistent with legislative requirements.	y	As per LGIP 2017
SOW model	48.	The submitted SOW model is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline for LGIPs.	y	As per LGIP 2017
	49.	The SOW model has been prepared and populated consistent with the statutory guideline for LGIPs and its User manual for the SOW model.	y	As per LGIP 2017
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.	Y	Infrastructure strategies have since been updated, and tend not to be the subject of planning reports given the short term nature of their review. Plans are in place for such annual reviews to be reported, but until then, there is limited background planning reports of direct relevance to the amended LGIP. The superseded references are retained.