**Attachment 2: LGIP Checklist – Second compliance check**

**This checklist is part of Statutory Guideline 03/14 – Local government infrastructure plans**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review principles:**  • 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 | The LGIP sections are ordered in  accordance with the LGIP template. | Yes | Sections are in accordance  with LGIP template | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 2. | The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme. | Yes | The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme. | Yes | Sections are correctly located in the planning  scheme. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 3. | The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template. | Yes | 1) The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.  2) Additional content has been included  in the LGIP which is in addition to the mandatory components of the LGIP template. The basis for including this content is set out below in the Council’s comments for the relevant LGIP component.  3) Minor amendments have been made for consistency with the style and punctuation already used in Brisbane City Plan 2014 (CP2014). | Yes | Compliance with the mandatory components of the template is not  adversely impacted by the  proposed minor changes to the text in order to achieve consistency with the style and punctuation used in Brisbane City Plan 2014. Additional content is addressed at checklist item  6. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 4. | Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are  correct. | Yes | 1) Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are  correct.  2) Minor amendments have been made for consistency with the style already used in CP2014. | Yes | Text references to numbered paragraphs,  table and maps are correct. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| **Definitions** | 5. | Additional definitions (to those in the  QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements. | Yes | The existing CP2014 Brisbane City  Council administrative definitions in  SC1.2.3.B include:  • Existing trunk infrastructure  • Future trunk infrastructure  • Infrastructure corridor  • Desired standard of service  • Priority infrastructure area  • Trunk infrastructure  • Planning Horizon  These do not conflict with the statutory LGIP requirements. It is noted that a new definition will be added to Schedule 1 of the Planning Scheme (Assumed future urban development) which relates to the LGIP. It is also proposed to remove  ‘Infrastructure corridor’ as this is no longer  used in LGIP. These changes to Schedule  1 definitions of CP2014 will form part of the Major Amendment for Infrastructure Purposes (LGIP related). | Yes | The additional definitions  (to those in the QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements | None | LGIP may proceed |
| **Preliminary section** | 6. | The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template. | Yes | 1) The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template. | Yes | The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 7. | All five trunk networks included in the  LGIP. | Yes | 1) The Council’s trunk networks are  included in the LGIP, comprising: | Yes | The water and wastewater networks have been | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | If not, which networks are excluded?  Why have these networks been excluded? |  | a. Transport network (Road,  Pathway, Ferry Terminal & Bus stops);  b. Stormwater network; and c. Public parks and land for  community facilities network.  2) The water supply network and sewerage network related information is to be included in the Queensland Urban Utilities' (QUU) Water Netserv Plan. This approach was endorsed by QUU in a letter dated 30 April 2015.  3) DTMR endorsed the removal of the State controlled roads network from the LGIP in a letter dated 27 April  2015. |  | excluded due to their  inclusion in a Water Netserv plan. This is acceptable. BCC have stated that DTMR has endorsed the removal of State roads from the LGIP’s transport network. Although the letter from DTMR dated 27 April 2015  does not actually state this, it is noted that there is no requirement in SPA or guideline 03/14 that an LGIP include State controlled roads. Its exclusion is acceptable. |  |  |
| **Planning assumptions - structure** | 8. | The drafting of the Planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template. | Yes | 1) The Planning assumptions section is generally in accordance with the LGIP template.  2) The Residential development LGIP  development category in Column 1 of Table 4.2.1 has been disaggregated into Private residential development and other residential development as a prediction for non-private residential development.  3) DILGP has endorsed in a meeting on  5 May 2016 replacing the MS Word tables in section SC3.1 with an excel hyperlink.  4) DILGP have agreed in a meeting on  29 August 2016 that BCC may provide a description of the developable area  in place of a developable area map. DILGP have also advised that proposed text provided at meeting on  13 September 2016 looks appropriate subject to minor change which has  been made.  5) DILGP have agreed in a meeting on 5  May 2016 to a minor restructure of the planned density and demand table which combines columns 2 & 3 from the LGIP template such that an item can be read across a single row. | Yes | The planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template. The minor change to Table  4.2.1 and Table 3.1.3 is  considered necessary and adds to useability. DILGP have agreed to these minor changes.  BCC has advised that DILGP have agreed that the MS word tables in section SC3.1 may be replaced with an excel hyperlink. PIE Solutions has been provided with the minutes documenting this advice and is acceptable. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 9. | All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa. | Yes | Map A2 displays the boundaries of the projection areas. Map A2 will be legible at a lot level in Council’s CP2014 interactive mapping  ([https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/planning- building/planning-guidelines-](https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/planning-building/planning-guidelines-tools/brisbane-city-plan-2014/city-plan-2014-mapping)  [tools/brisbane-city-plan-2014/city-plan-](https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/planning-building/planning-guidelines-tools/brisbane-city-plan-2014/city-plan-2014-mapping)  [2014-mapping](https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/planning-building/planning-guidelines-tools/brisbane-city-plan-2014/city-plan-2014-mapping)). | Yes | All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the Map A2 and vice versa. | None | 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 | All the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant maps and vice versa.  Map A3 Stormwater Network Service Catchments, Map A4 Transport Network (Road Network) Service Catchments, Map A5 Public Parks Network Service Catchments, Map A6 Land for Community Facilities Network Service Catchments  and Map A7 Active and Public Transport | Yes | All of the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are  identified on the relevant  maps and vice versa.  All of the service catchments shown on the maps are also identified in the tables of infrastructure demand. | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | Network Service Catchments display the  boundaries of the service catchments for each Council network. |  |  |  |  |
| **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 predicted existing and future population and dwelling figures were prepared in 2016 for the LGIP. At this time  the most recent Queensland Government  Statistician Office (QGSO) population and dwelling projections was the 2015 Edition (medium series).  The QGSO, dwelling projection for the  Brisbane Local Government Area (LGA) at  2036 was used to set the overall control total (the projected dwelling demand) in the modelling. The 2011 to 2016 projection period of the QGSO dwelling  projections is excessive and not consistent with the existing level of development at  2014 and building completions rates; this period has been adjusted downwards to a realistic level of development and the excess has been redistributed to later  years to ensure the overall growth to 2036  remains the same.  Council’s internal dwelling supply  modelling only uses the QGSO projections  (dwelling demand) at a Brisbane LGA level. The BCC model undertakes smaller area potential ‘supply’ of residential dwellings, including analysing and reporting at the Statistical Area 2 (SA2) level. These SA2 figures are further shared with QGSO for when they are preparing their ‘small area projections’. Hence the SA2 projections published by the State Government are based on BCC’s figures with small adjustments made by the State to include persons  whom are residing in non-private dwellings such as ‘gaols’. Council has also included persons in non-private dwellings provided by the State Government within the  population projections.  The QGSO provided BCC with the 2015  Edition occupancy rates for each time period from 2011 to and including 2036 for both attached and detached dwellings at the SA2 level. These occupancy rates  were used to convert residential dwelling figures into population.  Note: The geography of the Brisbane LGA based on the 2011 Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS). | Yes | The dwelling target and period targets (i.e. 2016,  2021, 2026, 2031, 20236)  are based on the 2015  Edition State Government (QGSO) dwelling projections (medium series). Some modifications had to be made to these dwelling projections for use in the  residential supply model as the growth for 2011 to 2016 period is far in excess of  the existing level of development and building completion rates for this period; excess growth for this time period was redistributed to remaining  projection years to ensure  that the total growth to  2036 remains the same. The BCC LGIP dwelling projections therefore start at a lower base number of dwellings but catch up to the 2015 QGSO medium series projections by 2036.  The BCC LGIP population projections start at 12,000 persons less than the QGSO projection in 2016 and this gap widens to approximately 26,000 persons less than the QGSO projection in 2036.  The likely cause of this “target undershoot”, is that the adopted total dwelling targets from the QGSO is based on a particular geographical (SA2) distribution of dwelling growth by dwelling type. However, the total dwelling target has been inputted to the BUG model at a citywide level for all types  of dwellings. The BUG then projects residential development in any geographic region and of any type to meet these  total dwelling targets. This has resulted in a different geographical distribution of dwelling growth by dwelling type than that assumed by the QGSO. When the SA2 level detached and | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | attached average  occupancy rates are applied to the BUG dwelling projections, the resultant population is different to the QGSO target. Given the inherent uncertainty in future  projected occupancy rates, the BCC population and dwelling projections are considered to adequately reflect the QGSO 2015 medium series projections. |  |  |
| 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 | The employment non-residential development projections are based on  employment projections prepared in  November 2014 by the Queensland Treasury and Trade (QTT) in conjunction with SEQCoM and National Institute of Economic and industry Research. These projections are provided at the SA2 geographic scale.  The employment projections are based on Census 2011 employment with adjustments and the floor space for non- residential uses is based on Council’s Land Use Activity Dataset (LUAD) 2014, which contains actual measured and estimated floor space at point in time. The bases of these two datasets are adjusted using the building approval pipeline to provide a more accurate position at 2016. The employment projections are  converted from industrial classification to LGIP development categories using a concordance. Non-residential floor space  is calculated by applying the rate of growth from the employment projections to the base floor space obtained from the LUAD dataset.  The ultimate employment non-residential development is calculated separately from the projections and is placed alongside  the end of the projection period. Note that ultimate development may be lower than the existing level of development where an existing use is on land zoned for a different purpose that has not yet occurred.  The full methodology for the development of the employment and non-residential projections is located in the extrinsic material for the planning assumptions.  Note: for the purposes of the LGIP, the residential and non-residential growth and also network demand tables have all been reported to year 2031. | Yes | The employment projections used in the  LGIP are known as the  SEQ Council of Mayors (SEQCoM) employment projections, Queensland Treasury and Trade (QTT) primary scenario and were completed in November  2014. The overall population and employment assumptions  were prepared by QTT and were then allocated to a small area by the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research (NIEIR).  The employment projections were converted into GFA projections by applying the projected growth in employment to the base year GFA. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 13. | The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding. | Yes | Developable area has been calculated separately for residential and non- residential modelling. | Yes | The planning assumptions extrinsic material report outlines the planning scheme overlays that have | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | For both residential and non-residential  developable area calculations, the following constraints were applied:  • Biodiversity Areas (High ecological significance and Priority koala habitat area),  • Flood, overland flow and river (flood planning area 1)  • Waterway corridors (Brisbane River and Citywide waterway)  • Wetlands (Wetland),  • Slope (‘slope greater than 25%’)  • Road hierarchy (future arterial road)  • Conservation zone (Local, District, Metropolitan)  • Environmental management zone  • Open space zone (Local, District, Metropolitan)  • Sport and Recreation (Local, District, Metropolitan)  Further information relating to the physical, environmental and policy constraints that were used in calculating developable area are set out in the Planning Assumptions extrinsic material report. |  | been used to determine the  developable area for residential and non- residential development.  Table 4.2.2.1 of the LGIP lists the developable area constraint overlays which have been used to define the developable area. |  |  |
| 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 used reflect the realistic level (scale and intensity) of  development. They have been calculated with reference to the land use and yield provisions of the planning scheme, site constraints, development trends from  approval data and the scale and land use  mix of existing development.  Further information relating to the planned density calculations is available in the Planning Assumptions extrinsic material report. | Yes | The planned densities have been prepared taking into  consideration development approvals, existing development, development trends and planning  scheme provisions.  The planned densities also include assumptions for certain neighbourhood plans that have not yet been adopted by Council.  The planned densities are considered to reflect realistic levels and types of development.  As part of the preparation of the next LGIP, the planned densities for these neighbourhood plans should be revised to  ensure they reflect the adopted amendments to the planning scheme for these areas. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 15. | The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other  infrastructure. | Yes | A primary input into calculating planned density is the land use and yield  provisions of the planning scheme. These  provisions set out the intent for the future scale, type and location of development. The planned densities are reported for each zone and zone precinct of the planning scheme as well as for each neighbourhood plan and neighbourhood plan precinct where the generic zone | Yes | The extrinsic material  report states that for land in the Emerging Communities zone, the planned density and subsequent modelling has taken into account the provision of land for roads, parks and other infrastructure. The planned density for this zone | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | provisions do not apply.  Land required for local roads and other infrastructure such as trunk parks is taken into account, this is mostly prevalent in the Emerging Community zone. This is specified in section 3.4.1 of the Planning Assumptions extrinsic material. |  | assumes 22dw/ha for  attached dwellings and 18 dw/ha for detached dwellings with a detached to attached probability of  80%.  It is not clear from the extrinsic material whether land required for future local roads and parks has  been accounted for in other planned densities, however it is noted that land in these other zones is generally brownfield in nature  (already subdivided), with little prospect of new roads and parks being provided as part of any redevelopment. |  |  |
| 16. | The population and employment projection tables identify “ultimate development” in accordance with the QPP definition. | Yes | All of the projected population, dwellings, employment and floor space tables identify ‘ultimate development’ in accordance with the QPP definition.  In calculating *residential ultimate development* a number of planning and development related inputs are used in BCC’s Urban Supply Model. The ultimate development figure represents the potential residential dwelling supply that might be taken up in Brisbane after the QGSO ‘demand’ for 2036 has been reached.  In calculating *non- residential ultimate development* a number of planning and development related inputs are used in BCC’s non-residential ultimate calculator. | Yes | All of the projected population, dwellings, employment and floor space tables identify  ‘ultimate development’ in  accordance with the QPP  definition. | None | 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 projected population, dwellings, employment and floor space tables are reported for each SA2 in the Brisbane  LGA. All of these tables report figures from  2016 to 2031 and also include an ultimate development figure. The remaining capacity may be calculated by subtracting  2031 from Ultimate.  The ultimate development figures for residential and non-residential represent the realistic development capacity of CP2014 at point in time for the projection areas.  The residential modelling is carried out through a property level model that will only develop properties in the projections years where there is capacity.  The non-residential modelling utilises employment projections that are set at a local geography (SA2) which indicates the potential future demand for jobs in this area. The ultimate development potential for employment is calculated separately | Yes | The projection tables state ultimate development for each projection area and can be used to determine the remaining capacity for  growth past 2031.  It was found that there is capacity for an increase in overall dwellings and total GFA from 2031 to ultimate development in all SA2s. | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | from the employment projections and  provides the overall supply. Following the calculation of ultimate the employment projections are adjusted by capping to ultimate capacity and where excess demand exists this is redistributed to other areas with capacity. It should also be  noted that the consultants preparing the employment projections were provided with zoning, land use and GFA data (LUAD). |  |  |  |  |
| 18. | The planning assumptions reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development. | Yes | Planning assumptions cover three main components with these components being the existing and projected growth, the assumed scale of development (planned density) and the infrastructure demand  rates and infrastructure demand in  network catchments. The planning assumptions tables for existing and projected growth are the only component of planning assumptions that have a relationship with efficient and sequential pattern of development.  There are various inputs and outputs that make up the existing and projected growth figures, with the methodology differing in parts for potential future residential supply and potential non-residential supply.  The projected existed and future population, dwellings, employment and floor space projection (demand) figures from 2016 through to and including 2036, reflect the Queensland Government’s demographic and economic demand at the Brisbane LGA level. In BCC’s residential modelling, the QGSO dwelling projections at the Brisbane LGA are the  only figures that are used, with these used to set the targets (demand) at each five year time frame. Hence the SA2 figures  are modelled by Council and are based on the various planning and development  assumptions that are input into the supply  modelling. The assumptions at the SA2 level therefore represent an efficient and sequential pattern of development.  The Employment and floor space projections at the SA2 level (LGIP Projection Area) sourced from the Queensland Government (carried out by SEQCoM and NIEIR) have been prepared using an established series of integrated macro and micro economic models. | Yes | The projections of residential and non- residential growth have been prepared using a methodology that should  reflect an efficient,  sequential pattern of development. For residential development  this has included the use of a pricing model to calculate the likelihood of a site developing. The pricing model uses information such as the existing land use / activity occurring on a site and the number of existing residential dwellings on a site to evaluate its propensity to develop. Also, much of the Brisbane LGA is already developed. If redevelopment of this area is in any way sequential, it is likely to be based on the profitability of developing particular sites within the PIA. | None | 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 | At the time of preparing of the Planning  Assumptions for the purposes of CP2014 gazettal, several Queensland Government  departments and QUU were consulted with.  DTMR on occasion request the latest residential modelling outputs for input into their transport models. The data used by DTMR is obtained via QTT which includes | Yes | BCC has provided correspondence from  DTMR dated 27 April 2015 confirming that DTMR considered discussions between the parties to be  sufficient to meet BCC’s  obligations under Part B,  2.4B Step 2 of Guideline  04/14. | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | Council’s residential modelling outputs  and also QTT population and dwelling projections; it is worth noting that the QTT population and dwelling projections also utilise Council’s residential modelling outputs which includes land supply information. This indicates a level of alignment between the data used and modelling prepared amongst these  parties. DTMR has most recently requested this information in alignment with the QTT 2015 edition population and dwelling projections. DTMR has also been using the SEQCoM, Nov 2014  employment projections.  QUU also request the latest residential modelling outputs and development approval data to input into their model and other analyses for their network planning and servicing strategies. QUU will no longer have their networks included in the City Plan LGIP as they shift to their NetServ plan. QUU have most recently requested the urban growth modelling outputs and development approval data in early 2016. |  |  |  |  |
| **Planning assumptions - demand** | 20. | The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of population and employment growth. | Yes | The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of dwellings and employment growth for the transport and parks and land for community facilities  networks.  The infrastructure demand projections for the stormwater network are based on the zoning pattern of the City, existing impervious area and components of the residential and no-residential growth projections.  Non-private dwellings (NPDs) have been included within Table SC3.1.4—Existing and projected residential dwellings. NPDs have been included as a separate line below the ‘Total for Private residential dwellings’. This approach was taken to ensure consistency with the way private residential dwellings are reported by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the Queensland Government Statisticians Office and DILGP SEQ Regional Plan. DILGP have agreed at a meeting on 29  August 2016 that the proposed structure for inclusion is generally consistent with the template. | Yes | The infrastructure demand projections for the transport and parks and land for community facilities  networks are based on the projections of population  and employment growth.  The infrastructure demand projections for the stormwater network are based on the zoning pattern of the City and assumptions of impervious area and components of the growth projections. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 21. | The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data. | Yes | The demand generation rates align with accepted industry standard rates.  As a result of public consultation, Council  has revised its methodology in determining trip generation rates for the ferry terminal network to reflect a more accurate demand across the infrastructure network.  The conversion rate will be lowered to  0.07101.  This is based on an extract of relevant and | Yes | The demand generation rates used to project  demand for the roads,  public transport (bus stops), parks and LFCF and stormwater networks align with accepted industry rates.  As a result of public consultation, BCC has | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | recent Brisbane based Translink data and  better reflects the ferry share of public transport trips.  Information was not available to  distinguish local and wider ferry catchment use. The reduced number of trips resulting from lowering the conversion rate does not result in a change to ferry terminal infrastructure in the schedule of works as the proposed works are necessary to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act (Cth) 1992, as well as improving flood resilience. These are not impacted by the number of forecast passengers. |  | revised the demand  generation rate for the ferry network, conceding that a rate of 0.1208 person trips per day / dwelling for detached dwellings is excessive. This has been reduced to 0.07101 person trips per day / dwelling for detached dwellings. BCC has stated that the reduced demand generation rate is more realistic. BCC has also advised that reducing the demand generation  rate has had no impact on the schedule of works for  this network as the proposed works are needed to comply with the  *Disability Discrimination*  *Act (Cth) 1992,* as well as improving flood resilience.  The change to the ferry network demand generation rate is acceptable. |  |  |
| 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 relevant PFTI maps and  demand tables.  The service catchments are identified on Map A3 Stormwater Network Service Catchments, Map A4 Transport Network (Road Network) Service Catchments, Map A5 Public Parks Network Service Catchments, Map A6 Land for Community Facilities Network Service Catchments  and Map A7 Active and Public Transport Network Service Catchments, rather than on the PFTI maps.  The SOW tables in the extrinsic material reports for each network identify the  service catchment(s) for each item of trunk infrastructure.  The demand tables state the demand projections for each network by service catchment. | Yes | See response at checklist item 10. The demand tables for each network  include each of the identified service  catchments for those  networks. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 23. | The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA. | Yes | The service catchments for each network cover the PIA. | Yes | Stormwater - the service catchments cover the entire local government area and include land that is both inside and outside  the PIA.  Transport – the service catchments cover most of the local government area (excluding some reserve land) and include land that is both inside and outside the PIA | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Public parks – the service catchments cover the entire local government area and include land that is both inside and outside the PIA  Land for Community Facilities – the service catchments cover the entire local government area and include land that is both inside and outside the PIA |  |  |
| 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 | Refer to the attached internal Council  Memo from Council’s Chief Financial  Officer to Council’s Manager City Planning Economic Development stating that the gap between infrastructure charges revenue and trunk infrastructure expenditure can be funded. The attached Memo also includes the following extracts from Council’s Long Term Financial Sustainability Model (LTFSM) for the most recently published budget (2016-17 currently) detailing over the next 10 years forecasts of:  • Revenue – broken down by infrastructure charges and other revenue.  • Operating Expenditure  • Capital Expenditure – broken down by renewals, LGIP infrastructure, and other capital expenditure.  Councils LTAMP contains statements of growth drivers, however it does not  contain projections of growth and demand Refer to the LTAMP which has been provided. The LTAMP is considered to be aligned with the LGIP in this regard.  As a result of public consultation, some project costs were revised. This has resulted in an increase of $3,908,963 to the forecast expenditure over the LGIP planning horizon. This is a 0.19% increase in forecast expenditure (from  $2,043,597,744 to $2,047,506,707). This change has no material impact on the financial sustainability analysis Council had previously undertaken for the first compliance check. | Yes | BCCs LTAMP contains statements of growth  drivers but does not contain projections of growth and demand. It is not possible to determine  whether there is alignment  at present, however BCC has advised that there is a process underway to achieve alignment.  BCC has provided a memorandum from its CFO which demonstrates that  the Council’s LTFF is generally aligned with the projections of growth in the LGIP.  As a result of some changes to the schedules of work following public consultation, BCC has advised that capital expenditure over the 10 year planning horizon of the LGIP has increased by  $3,908.963. It has also advised that this increase in expenditure has no material impact on the financial sustainability analysis it has previously undertaken. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| **Priority infrastructure**  **area (PIA)** | 25. | The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template. | Yes | The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template. | Yes | The drafting of the PIA  section is consistent with the LGIP template. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 26. | Text references to PIA map(s) are correct. | Yes | Text references associated with Map A1  Priority Infrastructure Area are correct. | Yes | The reference to the PIA  map (Map A1) is correct. | None | 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 shown on the Map A1  Priority Infrastructure Area will be legible at a lot level in Council’s CP2014 interactive mapping ([https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/planning- building/planning-guidelines-](https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/planning-building/planning-guidelines-tools/brisbane-city-plan-2014/city-plan-2014-mapping) | Yes | Although the PIA map (Map A1) is not legible at the lot level and does not  show the planning scheme  zoning, the DILGP has previously advised that it is | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | [tools/brisbane-city-plan-2014/city-plan-](https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/planning-building/planning-guidelines-tools/brisbane-city-plan-2014/city-plan-2014-mapping)  [2014-mapping](https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/planning-building/planning-guidelines-tools/brisbane-city-plan-2014/city-plan-2014-mapping)), and the planning scheme zoning is also shown on the interactive mapping.  The PIA boundary is also shown at lot level on all relevant PFTI maps. |  | acceptable to have a  citywide PIA map that does not show the planning scheme zoning if the electronic (web based) version of the maps includes a PIA map legible at the lot level and which shows the zoning information. BCC has advised that this will be the case. It is also noted that the PIA is shown on the PFTI maps at the lot level. |  |  |
| 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 all  relevant trunk infrastructure networks at  the time the LGIP was prepared. The PIA now includes the Lower Oxley Creek North Neighbourhood Plan boundary and  two emerging community properties – one at The Gap and the other at Bridgeman Downs.  Following public consultation, Council has included a small area of reclaimed land to ensure the full Port of Brisbane Estate is included within the PIA. | Yes | The PIA includes all areas of existing urban  development serviced by  all relevant trunk infrastructure networks at the time the LGIP was prepared.  Following public consultation, BCC has advised that a small area of reclaimed land at the port  of Brisbane has been included in the PIA.  This inclusion is acceptable. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 29. | The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years but no more than 15  years. | Yes | The PIA accommodates growth for at least  10 years. | Yes | The extrinsic material report states that the PIA  identifies the area that  Council intends to prioritise for the provision of all trunk infrastructure networks to service urban growth for a minimum of 10 years. This is consistent with the PIA horizon of 2026 stated in section 4.3 of the LGIP.  The PIA by definition must include existing urban areas. Due to the significant expanse of the  existing urban area and the increased densities that  can be achieved in these areas, the BCC PIA has significant capacity to accommodate both non- residential GFA and dwellings growth past 2026 and even 2031. Most of  this growth will necessarily be redevelopment of the existing urban area to accommodate higher density development. This is because unconstrained land suitable for low density subdivision is  extremely limited within the  Brisbane local government | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | area. |  |  |
| 30. | Are there areas outside the PIA for which the planning assumptions identify urban growth within the next 10 to15  years?  If so, why have these areas been excluded from the PIA? | Yes | There are no areas outside the PIA that would constitute urban growth areas within the next 10-15 years. | Yes | The planning assumptions tables indicate that there are no areas outside the  PIA which would constitute urban growth areas within  the next 10-15 years. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 31. | The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development. | Yes | The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development. | Yes | Growth in Brisbane is predominately within existing brownfield areas, meaning that the sequence of development within the PIA is more difficult to  control than in green-field  areas. New green-field development is on the periphery of the existing urban area and is considered to be efficient and sequential. The PIA is considered to achieve an efficient, sequential pattern of development. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| **Desired standards of**  **service (DSS)** | 32. | The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template. | Yes | The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template. | Yes | The drafting of the DSS  section is consistent with the LGIP template. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 33. | The DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each network. | Yes | The DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each of the Council trunk infrastructure networks. | Yes | The DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each of  BCC’s trunk infrastructure  networks. | None | 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 | 1) The DSS reflects the key, high level industry standards, regulatory and  statutory guidelines and codes, and  planning scheme policies about infrastructure.  2) Refer to the following sections of the extrinsic material reports for detail regarding the DSS:  • Transport Network—section 4.5;  • Stormwater Network—section 4.5;  • Public Parks and Land for Community  Facilities Network—section 4.5. | Yes | A benchmarking exercise was undertaken by PIE  Solutions to compare  BCC’s key DSS for each network against those used by other local  governments. The benchmarking exercise is documented in a memorandum titled *Brisbane City Council LGIP Review – Desired Standards of Service* dated  5 December 2017. The key DSS were found to be reflective of industry standards. | None | 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 | There is some alignment between the relevant levels of service in Council’s LTAMP & LGIP and there is an ongoing  process in place to achieve greater  alignment into the future. In addition, a future development infrastructure management system is being developed to reflect the infrastructure planning lifecycle, including LGIP, financial sustainability and asset management. | Yes | BCC’s LTAMP does not state the desired standards of service for each  infrastructure network.  Instead, it refers to a suite of specific asset management plans (AMPS) which provide an  additional level of detail for each class of asset. Each AMP states the current and desired level (or standard) of service for the particular class of asset relevant to that plan. The levels of service stated in the AMPs typically have the same | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | objective as the  quantitative standards of service stated in the LGIP, but are often measured quite differently. This makes a direct comparison difficult. BCC has advised that there is a process underway to align the relevant levels of service. |  |  |
| **Plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) – structure and text** | 36. | The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template. | Yes | The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template. | Yes | The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template despite a couple of minor additions to the text having been  made. These are as  follows:  • Addition of Editor’s note to 4.5(1) clarifies that water and sewerage network plans for infrastructure are included in QUU’s Water Netserv plan. This addition provides clarity to users of the LGIP.  • 4.5.1(1) addition of word ‘conceptually’ when referring to PFTI maps. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 37. | PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section. | Yes | PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in Preliminary section of the LGIP, specifically part 3(d). | Yes | PFTI maps are identified  for all networks listed in the Preliminary section of the LGIP. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 38. | PFTI schedule of works summary tables for future infrastructure are included for all networks listed in the Preliminary section. | Yes | PFTI schedule of works summary tables for future infrastructure are included for all networks listed in the Preliminary section of the LGIP (part 3(d)). | Yes | The PFTI schedule of works summary tables for future infrastructure are included for all networks listed in the Preliminary section. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| **PFTI – Maps**  *[Add rows to the checklist to*  *address these items for each*  *of the networks]* | 39. | The maps clearly identify the existing and future trunk infrastructure networks  distinct from each other. | Yes | **All networks:**  The PFTI maps clearly identify the existing and future trunk infrastructure networks  distinct from each other. This distinction is a product of contrasting colours, as per QPP standards. | Yes | **Transport**  The maps clearly identify existing and future trunk  infrastructure distinct from each other.  **Stormwater**  The maps clearly identify existing and future trunk infrastructure distinct from each other.  **Public Park & Land for Community Facilities** The maps clearly identify existing and future trunk infrastructure distinct from each other. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 40. | The service catchments referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure  demand summary tables are shown clearly on the maps. | Yes | **All networks:**  The service catchments for the referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown  clearly on Map A3-A7 Service Catchments and on the PFTI Maps. Further detail | Yes | See response at checklist  Item 10 | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | about the service catchment methodology  is contained in the individual network  Extrinsic Material. |  |  |  |  |
| 41. | Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level)  clearly on the maps including a legible map reference. | Yes | **All networks:**  Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the PFTI maps, including a legible map reference. Labels with leaders, from the QPP standard, are utilised to clearly distinguish components  at a project level. | Yes | **Transport**  All future trunk infrastructure components are clearly identified and labelled on the PFTI maps, including a legible map reference.  **Stormwater**  All future trunk infrastructure components are clearly identified and labelled on the PFTI maps including a legible map reference.  **Public Parks & Land for**  **Community Facilities** All future trunk infrastructure components are clearly identified and labelled on the PFTI maps including a legible map reference. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| 42. | The infrastructure map reference is shown in the SOW model and summary  schedule of works table in the LGIP. | Yes | **All networks:**  The infrastructure map reference for each item of future trunk infrastructure identified on the PFTI maps is shown in the SOW  model and summary schedule of works table in the LGIP. | Yes | **Transport**  All infrastructure identified in the SOW tables in the LGIP are identified on the  PFTI maps and vice versa.  All items are included in  SOW Model.  **Stormwater**  All infrastructure identified in the SOW tables in the LGIP are identified on the PFTI maps and vice versa. Changes made to the PFTI maps following public consultation are replicated in the SOW Model.  All items are included in  SOW Model.  **Public Parks & Land for**  **Community Facilities**  All infrastructure identified in the SOW tables in the LGIP are identified on the PFTI maps and vice versa. Changes made to the PFTI maps following public  consultation are replicated  in the SOW Model.  All items are included in  SOW Model. | None | LGIP may proceed |
| **Schedules of works**  *[Add rows to the checklist to* | 43. | The schedule of works tables in the  LGIP complies with the LGIP template. | Yes | **All networks:**  The schedule of works tables in SC3.2 of the LGIP complies with the LGIP template. All columns identified in the LGIP template | Yes | The schedule of works tables in the LGIP complies  with the LGIP template. | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *address these*  *items for each*  *of the networks]* |  |  |  | are incorporated into the schedule of  works, as well as additional columns providing detail on suburb, service catchments and a description of the project. |  |  |  |  |
| 44. | The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline. | Yes | **All networks:**  The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline. All identified infrastructure in the schedule of works complies with the trunk infrastructure definitions contained in the network extrinsic material.  Following consultation, some changes were made to the stormwater and public parks and land for community facilities PFTI as follows.  **Stormwater**  SW176 map change: Addition of pipe drainage (HEM-PR-013) and HEM-PR-  014.  The additional infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.  **Public parks and land for community facilities**  PCF295 and PCF275 Map changes:  Move ROC-A1-002 back to position shown in the PIP.  PCF295 Map change:  Reinstate ROC-A1-019 to position shown in the PIP.  PCF240 Map change:  Change LGIP ID from DAR-U1-010 to  DAR-U3-010.  Reinstate DAR-E5-001 from PIP and change code to DAR-U1-011.  The changed infrastructure shown in the PFTI is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline. | Yes | **Transport**  **Roads -** The identified trunk infrastructure includes arterial, suburban and district roads. These road types are considered to be trunk infrastructure (see review of DSS for roads network) and are consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.  **Ferry -** The identified trunk infrastructure includes  LGIP extrinsic material identifies ferry terminal upgrades for flood resilience and DDA compliance. These are consistent with the DSS and are consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.  **Pathway -** The identified trunk infrastructure  includes off road cycleways and river walk. This infrastructure is considered to be consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.  **Stormwater**  The identified trunk stormwater infrastructure includes pipes, SQIDs, culverts, concrete lined channels, natural channels, land and rehabilitation. The additional stormwater infrastructure in the PFTI following consultation is  also consistent with the  SPA and LGIP guideline.  **Public parks and land for community facilities**  The identified trunk parks and land for community facilities network infrastructure includes are considered to be trunk  infrastructure (see review  of DSS for parks and land for community facilities network) and are consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.  The parks infrastructure that was changed following public consultation is | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | consistent with the SPA  and LGIP guideline. |  |  |
| 45. | The existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA. | Yes | **All networks:**  The existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA. | Yes | The extrinsic reports for each network state that an infrastructure planning exercise was undertaken  for each network consistent with the planning  assumptions (including  ultimate demand). Based on these reports and an inspection of the PFTI maps, it is agreed that the infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA. | None | 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 LTAMP identifies the requirement for infrastructure to be maintained, renewed  and enhanced. Council’s LTAMP does not  detail the schedule of works that is populated in the LGIP. Given this, The LTAMP is considered to be aligned with the LGIP in this regard.  Please refer to the attached Internal Memo from Council’s Chief Financial Officer to Council’s Manager City Planning  & Economic Development confirming that the gap between infrastructure charges revenue and trunk infrastructure expenditure can be funded (**Attachment A**).  With respect to the relevant inputs of the LTAMP and LTFF, refer to Council’s comments at items 24 and 35. | Yes | BCC has provided an  Internal Memo from Council’s Chief Financial Officer to Council’s Manager City Planning & Economic Development confirming that the gap between infrastructure charges revenue and trunk infrastructure expenditure can be funded. This is adequate to confirm that the scope, estimated cost and planned timing of proposed trunk capital works contained within the Schedule of Works aligns with the relevant inputs of the LTFF. | None | 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 | **Transport:**  The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is consistent with legislative requirements.  Future land costs are based on the application of rates that reflect the anticipated market cost of acquiring the land. This method is detailed in the transport network extrinsic material report.  Future direct construction costs are based on the application of rates and quantities that reflect the anticipated market cost of construction. In addition to the direct construction cost, indirect construction cost, project cost and construction contingencies are also applied, and are consistent with the LGIP statutory guideline.  **Stormwater:**  The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works | Yes | The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is  consistent with legislative requirements. Detailed  comment on the cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW Models is provided in memorandum titled  *Brisbane City Council LGIP*  *Review - Schedule of*  *Works Model* dated 5  December 2017. | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | tables is consistent with legislative  requirements.  Future land costs are based on individual valuations, and reflect the anticipated market rate of acquiring the land. This method is detailed in the network extrinsic material report.  Future direct construction costs are based on the application of rates and quantities that reflect the anticipated market cost of construction. In addition to the direct construction cost, indirect construction cost, project cost and construction contingencies are also applied, and are consistent with the LGIP statutory guideline.  **Public parks and land for community facilities:**  The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is consistent with legislative requirements.  For the parks network, all acquisition costs are based on individual valuations, and reflect the anticipated market rate of acquiring the land. These methods are detailed in the network extrinsic material report. For the land for community facilities network, future land costs are based on  the application of rates that reflect the anticipated market cost of acquiring the land.  Future direct construction costs are based on the application of rates and quantities that reflect the anticipated market cost of construction. In addition to the direct construction cost, indirect construction cost, project cost and construction contingencies are also applied, and are consistent with the LGIP statutory guideline. |  |  |  |  |
| **SOW model** | 48. | The submitted SOW model is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline for LGIPs. | Yes | The submitted SOW model is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline for LGIPs.  Councils SOW models contain the following functionality:  • Cost apportionment of existing and future infrastructure  • Escalation of costs for all future infrastructure items to the estimated time of delivery  • Discounting of future costs to represent the net present value of all future items  • Where necessary, adjustment of future infrastructure costs based to reflect terminal value calculation  • Average servicing cost at the service catchment level | Yes | The SOW model is consistent with the model included in the statutory  guidelines. Detailed  comment on the SOW Models is provided in memorandum titled *Brisbane City Council LGIP Review - Schedule of*  *Works Model* dated 5  December 2017.  Following public consultation, changes made by BCC to infrastructure items, costs and demand for particular networks have been replicated in the respective | None | LGIP may proceed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | • Projected infrastructure charges revenue based on the LGIP planning assumptions and Councils current charging regime  • A cash flow analysis that identifies the gap between expected expenditure and forecast revenue  The methodology of the above model functions are detailed in the SOW model extrinsic material report.  It is noted that Council has expressed the estimated timing for each item in the first five years of the schedule of works (2016-  2021) as 30 June 2019. DILGP has confirmed this is acceptable. |  | financial models. There is  consistency between the draft LGIP and the SOW models. |  |  |
| 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 prepared and populated consistent with the statutory guideline for LGIPs and its User manual for the SOW model.  Councils SOW models are populated with the following inputs:  • Financial rates (escalation and discount rates)  • Existing and future demand by service catchment  • Future demand in line with Councils infrastructure charging regime  • Existing and future infrastructure costs by service catchment  • terminal value adjustments  It is noted that Council has expressed the estimated timing for each item in the first five years of the schedule of works (2016-  2021) as 30 June 2019. DILGP has confirmed this is acceptable.  It is also noted that Council has grouped existing infrastructure costs by infrastructure type within each service catchment. DILGP has confirmed this is acceptable. | Yes | The SOW model has been prepared and populated consistent with the statutory guidelines for  LGIPs and its User manual for the SOW Model.  Detailed comment on the  consistency of the SOW Models is provided in memorandum titled *Brisbane City Council LGIP Review - Schedule of*  *Works Model* dated 5  December 2017.  Following public consultation, changes made by BCC to infrastructure items, costs and demand for particular networks have been replicated in the respective financial models. There is consistency between the draft LGIP and the SOW models. | None | 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 preparation of the  LGIP are available and identified in the list  of extrinsic material in the editor’s note immediately following section 4.5.2 of the LGIP. These include:  • Stormwater Network Extrinsic Material  • Transport Network Extrinsic Material  • Public Parks and Land for Community  Facilities Network Extrinsic Material  • Planning Assumptions Extrinsic  Material  • Schedule of Works Model Extrinsic  Material. | Yes | 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 editor’s note immediately following section 4.5.2 of the LGIP | None | LGIP may proceed |

**Attachments:**

**Attachment A** - CFO Memo