

LGIP Checklist – Ipswich City Council LGIP

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 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 draft LGIP has been prepared and is structured in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	All sections within the 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 draft LGIP is to be included as Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme rather than Part 4. This is consistent with the current Ipswich Planning Scheme which was prepared under the <i>Integrated Planning Act</i> (ie is not a QPP planning scheme). The draft Part 13 includes all required tables and mapping.	Yes	The LGIP sections, when adopted as Chapter 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme, will be correctly located in this planning scheme prepared under the <i>Integrated Planning Act</i> .	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		3.	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Yes	The mandatory content has been included in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	The LGIP is compliant, noting that sections have been added or changed given the LGIP will form Chapter 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme, which was prepared under the <i>Integrated Planning Act</i> . Integran believe this is a logical and necessary amendment to the template given the statutory constraints in forming alignment between the <i>Integrated Planning Act</i> and the <i>Sustainable Planning Act</i> .	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		4.	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Yes	All references are correct.	Yes	All text references to numbered paragraphs and tables are correct.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions (to those in the QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements.	Yes	Not Applicable - the current Ipswich Planning Scheme was prepared under the <i>Integrated Planning Act</i> (ie is not a QPP planning scheme).	Yes	Additional definitions have been provided to improve comprehension of the LGIP. Alignment of definitions is not required in this LGIP as the Ipswich Planning Scheme was developed under the <i>Integrated Planning Act</i> .	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 drafted to be consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The Preliminary section is consistent with statutory requirements given the LGIP will form Chapter 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme, which was prepared under the <i>Integrated Planning Act</i> . Additional paragraphs (13.1(3)(f) to (i)) have been added to detail the expanded contents of the draft LGIP that would have normally been incorporated in Schedule 3 of an LGIP prepared under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act</i> .	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 transport (roads), public parks and land for community facilities trunk networks have been included. The water and sewerage trunk networks have not been included as they are planned and administered by Queensland Urban Utilities (Water Distributor-Retailer). Council's current LGIP (statutorily converted Priority Infrastructure Plan) does not include a stormwater trunk network. As necessary stormwater infrastructure is provided at the individual site level through the development process in accordance with existing planning scheme provisions, a stormwater trunk infrastructure network has not been included in the draft LGIP.	Yes	ICC have included two of the statutory trunk networks (Transport and Public Parks and Land for Community Facilities) in their draft LGIP, however for the purposes of planning, Public Parks has been separated from Land for Community Facilities to form two LGIP networks. Water and Sewerage networks have been excluded as Queensland Urban Utilities are the relevant Distributor-Retailer for these networks. The Stormwater network has been excluded as existing ICC development policies allow for this infrastructure to be provided on a site-by-site basis.	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 consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	Minor amendments have been made to the Planning Assumptions section to facilitate inclusion of the LGIP into the existing planning scheme. The Planning Assumptions section is consistent with statutory requirements given the LGIP will form Chapter 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme, which was prepared under the <i>Integrated Planning Act</i> .	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		9.	All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa.	Yes	All projection areas have been included in the relevant tables and shown on the relevant maps.	Yes	All projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on Map 1 – Local Government Infrastructure Plan Projection Areas.	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	The service catchments for each network have been included in the relevant tables and have also been identified on the corresponding PFTI maps.	Yes	Service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on relevant PFTI maps, with the full extent of service catchments shown in the Extrinsic Material for each 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).	Yes	The population and dwelling projections have been calibrated to the targets set in the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2009-2031 (SEQ RP 2031) which is the pre-eminent land use planning document with which the Ipswich Planning Scheme is required to align. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update 2016 for further details.	Yes	Population and dwelling projections have been calibrated using the South East Queensland Regional Plan. This results in projections above the QGSO projections in every 5 year cohort until 2036. Given the over-riding need for the Ipswich Planning Scheme to align to the SEQ Regional Plan, the use of these Population and Dwelling targets for infrastructure planning purposes is appropriate.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		12.	The employment and non-residential development projections align with the available economic development studies, other reports about	Yes	The draft LGIP is an update of the statutorily converted LGIP. Regard has been given to relevant ABS demographic projections, ABS 2011 Census data, the	Yes	Employment and non-residential development projections have been developed using a bottom-up approach, utilising landuse data and development categories from Council's rating	N/A	LGIP may proceed

			employment or historical rates for the area.		National Institute of Economic and Industry Research (NIEIR) report, State treasury projections and to Ipswich City Council's economic development planning. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update 2016 for further details.		systems, digital orthographic survey, and site inspections to calculate existing building footprints and associated floorspace. Conversion factors were then applied in order to calculate the existing floorspace and likely employment figures. Growth in employment is calibrated against the projected population increases up to the Planned Ultimate capacity of the planning scheme. This approach does result in differences between the figures produced by the ABS from the 2011 Census, however the detailed approach taken for the LGIP is considered suitable for infrastructure planning purposes.		
	13.	The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding.	Yes	The Ipswich Population Modeller (IPM) utilises constraint and zoning information from the Ipswich Planning Scheme when determining development yields and planned densities. This ensures that constraints and the development intents for land within the city are fully integrated in the determination of developable areas. All flooding constraints have been removed from the developable yield calculations, whilst all other development constraints have been reflected within the applied density yields of the respective zone.	Yes	Hard constraints attributed to flooding have been removed from the developable yield analysis, whilst all other 'soft' constraints have been appropriately accounted for within the development densities applied to each zone.	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 draft LGIP is an update of the statutorily converted LGIP. The planned densities are based on ultimate development (the planned development capacity of the Ipswich Planning Scheme) and appropriately reflect realistic development intensities to achieve the targets contained in the SEQ RP 2031 to ensure alignment of land use planning with infrastructure planning and delivery. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update 2016 for further details.	Yes	Planned densities reflect planning scheme provisions within the Ipswich Planning Scheme. These account for any reductions in achievable densities based on 'soft' constraints identified within the relevant planning Scheme overlays. The assumptions demonstrate realistic standards which are consistent with current development in South East Queensland.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	The planned densities used in the Ipswich Population Modeller (IPM) are based on the Area Classification (zoning / land use designation) from the Ipswich Planning Scheme. These appropriately account for the land requirements for local infrastructure in estimating development yields. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document	Yes	The planned densities outlined within the LGIP and Planning Assumption Extrinsic Material represent Gross Densities that account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	

				– Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update 2016 for further details.					
		16.	The population and employment projection tables identify “ultimate development” in accordance with the QPP definition.	Yes	N/A - the current Ipswich Planning Scheme was prepared under the <i>Integrated Planning Act</i> (ie is not a QPP planning scheme). Notwithstanding, the planned densities are based on ultimate development (the planned development capacity as provided for in the Ipswich Planning Scheme). Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update 2016 for further details.	Yes	<p>The LGIP provides population and employment projections to “Ultimate Development”, however this definition is not consistent with the QPP standard. The key discrepancy in this definition is the truncation of demand projections for projection area I7 to 2041.</p> <p>The Extrinsic Material supporting the LGIP Planning Assumptions presents the planned ultimate non-residential floorspace and employment projections, however the LGIP document has truncated these to achieve better alignment with the rest of the Planning Scheme for the purpose of infrastructure planning.</p> <p>As the LGIP makes this distinction clear for the I7 Projection Area through the Definition of ‘Ultimate Development’, this requirement of the Checklist is considered satisfied.</p>	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		17.	Based on the information in the projection tables and other available material, it is possible to verify the remaining capacity to accommodate growth, for each projection area.	Yes	The projection tables identify the available capacity from the base year (2016) both within the PIA and to ultimate, demonstrating the ability to accommodate growth to achieve the SEQ RP 2031 targets (and beyond). The tables are structured to provide the required information on a ‘projection area’ basis. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update 2016 for further details.	Yes	<p>The projection tables within the LGIP provide the anticipated growth and remaining capacities for each identified projection area, aggregated with respect to the Priority Infrastructure Area. The planning assumptions extrinsic material also provides these projections as a total for each projection area.</p> <p>It is therefore possible to verify the remaining capacity of each projection area to accommodate growth.</p> <p>The Planning Assumption tables within the LGIP and planning assumption extrinsic material present the Ripley Valley PDA as a separate reporting column to increase transparency of the LGIP assumptions.</p>	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		18.	The planning assumptions reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The draft LGIP is an update of the statutorily converted LGIP and supporting documents that were based on an efficient and sequential pattern of growth. Whilst the proposed LGIP has taken into account changes in development intents and timing resulting from land use changes implemented through amendments to the planning scheme (including the Ipswich City Centre and Springfield Town Centre) and the declaration of the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area (PDA), no substantial change is proposed to the current extent of the PIA as part of this LGIP update.	Yes	The planning assumptions utilise the land use patterns planned in the existing Ipswich Planning Scheme to deliver an efficient and sequential pattern of development, in line with growth projections forecast in the South East Queensland Regional Plan.	N/A	LGIP may proceed

				Review of land in the PIA (and having regard to planned growth in the Ripley Valley PDA) indicates that the land is serviceable with trunk infrastructure and can accommodate projected residential and employment growth to 2031. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update 2016 for further details.					
		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	The Department of Transport and Main Roads and Queensland Urban Utilities have been consulted with during the preparation of the draft LGIP. Queensland Urban Utilities officers advised (verbally) that there were no issues that required further consideration or addressing. No response from the Department of Transport and Main Roads has been received.	Yes	In December 2016 and January 2017, ICC consulted with DTMR and QUU, seeking comments on the draft LGIP. Integran has sighted this correspondence from Council and is satisfied it meets the statutory requirements.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	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 outputs of the IPM based on ultimate development (the planned development capacity provided for in the Ipswich Planning Scheme) which have been calibrated to achieve the residential targets contained in the SEQ RP 2031 and having regard to regard to other relevant projections for employment growth. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update 2016 for further details.	Yes	Infrastructure demand projections have been calculated using projected population and employment growth and standard demand conversion factors to determine future infrastructure demand.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		21.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	Yes	The draft LGIP is an update of the statutorily converted LGIP and uses the Ipswich Population Modeller to project residential and employment growth assumptions. The demand generation rates generally remain the same as for those used in the current LGIP that have been developed based on research undertaken and guidance issued overtime. The trunk infrastructure network planning has been developed having regard to the desired standards of service for provision and further supplementary modelling where required (ie for the transport (roads) trunk infrastructure network). Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update	Yes	The demand generation rates for the relevant infrastructure networks have been developed using industry accepted rates. The rates adopted for the transport demand generation have been aligned with the assumptions and outputs used in the transport modelling and have been subject to detailed investigation and calibration with the likely traffic generated for the various landuses under the Ipswich Planning Scheme. The Public Parks and Land for Community Facilities generation rates have been derived from the planned demands for the various landuses under the Ipswich Planning scheme, having regard for the assumed population per dwelling type. The generation rates used in the LGIP align with	N/A	LGIP may proceed

				2016 and the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Transport (Roads) Update 2016 for further details.		those previously adopted in former infrastructure planning policies under the Ipswich Planning Scheme.			
		22.	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	Yes	The service catchments have been identified in the relevant tables and on PFTI maps in the supporting documents and the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	Service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables, with the full extent of service catchments shown in the Extrinsic Material for each network.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		23.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA.	Yes	The service catchments cover the PIA and the rest of the Ipswich Local Government Area. Refer to the PFTI maps in the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	All service catchments cover the PIA at a minimum.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		24.	The Asset Management Plan and Long Term Financial Forecast align with the LGIP projections of growth and demand. If not, is there a process underway to achieve this?	Yes	The need for the Ipswich Planning Scheme to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity to meet the urban growth projected in the South East Queensland Regional Plan requires that the planning assumptions in the LGIP are aligned (a failure to do so would lead to a mismatch in the land use planning assumptions and trunk infrastructure planning assumptions). The projections used for the Long Term Financial Forecast are required to meet regulatory requirements for testing a local government's overall financial sustainability. A specific LTFF has been developed to demonstrate Council's capacity to manage the growth forecast in the LGIP while maintaining its financial sustainability. The Asset Management Plans are premised on historical growth rates which are lower than those of the LGIP. Council's Asset Management Plans will be reviewed and amended on the basis of the observed growth rates in future periods.	Yes	Council has recognised the differences that exist between the demand (revenue) projections that underpin the LTFF versus those applied within the LGIP SoW model. Such differences are inevitable due to conflicting requirements between the <i>Local Government Regulation 2012, the Sustainable Planning Act</i> and LGIP Guidelines. Council has recognised that the revenue forecasts prepared for the LTFF are based on both the historical and foreseeable growth rates that do not align with the growth targets identified within the SEQ Regional Plan and therefore the LGIP. During LGIP review process, Council has provided modelled outputs of the LGIP revenue and expenditure forecasts using processes and producing the key indicators which are comparable to that required through the LTFF process. Council has, in scenario testing a higher growth rate, demonstrated that the increased capital works expenditure can be matched by increased revenues and debt serving capability. This is borne out in the financial ratios assessment which accompanied the reporting on the LTFF under the LGIP scenario. Council has adopted a prudent approach in line with actual revenue, given its obligations under the Local Government Act, however this can change as evidence of the SEQRP growth materialises, at which time Council can respond accordingly. This review process has been identified by Council as an integral part of its future budget modelling.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
Priority infrastructure		25.	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The PIA section has been drafted consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed

area (PIA)	26.	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	Yes	All references are correct.	Yes	All references to Priority Infrastructure Area maps 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 on Local Government Infrastructure Plan LGIP Map 2 - Priority infrastructure area is legible at the lot level. This map also includes the planning scheme zones in accordance with the LGIP guideline. Refer to the PIA maps in the draft Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	The PIA boundary shown on PIA maps is legible at a lot level and the planning scheme zoning inside the PIA 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 the existing land that has been developed for non-rural purposes and serviced with all relevant trunk infrastructure.	Yes	The PIA includes all areas of existing urban development which are serviced by all relevant trunk infrastructure networks.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	29.	The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years.	Yes	The PIA accommodates growth to meet demand for projected non-rural purposes (residential and employment) up to 2031. Development in the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area (Ripley Valley PDA) has been assessed as if it were included in the PIA. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report 2016 for further details.	Yes	<p>The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years and no more than 15 years.</p> <p>An analysis of the dwelling capacity within the PIA and Ripley PDA areas has found that at 2031 (the PIA Horizon) there remains approximately 30% capacity for new dwellings within these areas. The 30% of underutilised capacity is weighted towards the attached dwelling product, which is expected given such development is more likely to occur during the later periods before reaching full development of the Planning Scheme.</p> <p>The PIA boundary and Ripley PDA includes a significant amount of potential development land that relates to re-development or intensification opportunities, which have a lower propensity to develop in the short term.</p> <p>Council's justification within the Planning Assumptions Extrinsic Material document regarding the PIA capacity and expectations of development with respect to the Boundary is supported.</p>	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	The draft LGIP is an update of the statutorily converted LGIP and retains the existing PIA. Minor adjustments to the PIA have been performed to account for recently constructed urban development. The only area which the planning assumptions identify for growth within the next 10 to 15 years that is outside the PIA is in the Ripley Valley PDA. This has been excluded in accordance with the LGIP guideline from the PIA as this area is regulated under the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> .	Yes	<p>Pursuant to section 2.5.3b of the Statutory Guideline, Ripley Priority Development Area has been excluded from the PIA.</p> <p>The planning assumptions do not identify any other growth for non rural development outside the PIA within the next 10-15 years.</p>	N/A	LGIP may proceed

		31.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The draft LGIP is an update of the statutorily converted LGIP. The PIA supports a sequential pattern of development and has regard to existing infrastructure and its logical and efficient extension to provide infrastructure to meet projected growth to 2031.	Yes	The PIA has been drafted in to ensure that future urban growth is accommodated in an efficient and sequential pattern, having regard to existing and proposed infrastructure capacities.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
Desired standards of service (DSS)		32.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The DSS sections has been drafted consistent with the LGIP template and reflect those used in the network planning. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme) and Supporting Documents for the Transport (Roads), Public Parks and Land for Community Facilities trunk infrastructure networks.	Yes	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		33.	The DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each network.	Yes	The key planning and design standards are identified for each network in the DSS section with further detail included in the relevant extrinsic material document. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme) and Supporting Documents for the Transport (Roads), Public Parks and Land for Community Facilities trunk infrastructure networks.	Yes	The DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each network, consistent with the LGIP template, including performance indicators and standard asset inclusions. The DSS are further detailed within the respective Extrinsic Material documents.	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 draft LGIP is an update of the statutorily converted LGIP and each network has been reviewed and updated based on current information. Refer to the Supporting Documents for the Transport (Roads), Public Parks and Land for Community Facilities trunk infrastructure networks.	Yes	The DSS reflect the key industry and regulatory standards and codes used by Council in the provision of infrastructure. The DSS have been informed by existing Infrastructure Planning Scheme Policies and other externally published 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	Based on the assumptions and processes used to develop the LTFF it is an intended outcome that the LGIP is generally aligned with the levels of service in the LTAMP, adjusted to reflect the LGIP growth levels. The LTAMP will continue to be reviewed and updated to improve alignment based on observed growth rates over time.	Yes	Council has recognised the differences that exist between the demand (revenue) projections that underpin the LTFF versus those applied within the LGIP SoW model. Such differences are inevitable due to conflicting requirements between the <i>Local Government Regulation 2012, the Sustainable Planning Act</i> and LGIP Guidelines. Council has recognised that the revenue forecasts prepared for the LTFF are based on both the historical and foreseeable growth rates that do not align with the growth targets identified within the SEQ Regional Plan and therefore the LGIP. Given the intrinsic link between population and employment growth and necessary infrastructure to support this growth, the capital expenditure	N/A	LGIP may proceed

							<p>forecasting between these two documents will differ. As the Level of Service assumptions which underpin the infrastructure requirements in both processes are generally aligned, any differences will relate only to the forecasted timing of expenditure.</p> <p>During LGIP review process, Council has provided modelled outputs of the LGIP revenue and expenditure forecasts using processes and producing the key indicators which are comparable to that required through the LTFF process. Council has, in scenario testing a higher growth rate, demonstrated that the increased capital works expenditure can be matched by increased revenues and debt serving capability. This is borne out in the financial ratios assessment which accompanied the reporting on the LTFF under the LGIP scenario.</p> <p>Council has adopted a prudent approach in line with actual revenue, given its obligations under the Local Government Act, however this can change as evidence of the SEQRP growth materialises, at which time Council can respond accordingly. This review process has been identified by Council as an integral part of its future budget modelling.</p>		
Plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) – structure and text	36.	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The PFTI section has been drafted consistent with the LGIP template. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	37.	PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes	The PFTI maps have been identified and included in the draft LGIP for all identified networks. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	PFTI maps depicting all existing and future trunk infrastructure have been prepared for all LGIP networks identified 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	PFTI schedule of works summary tables have been included in the draft LGIP for all identified networks. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	PFTI Schedules of Works summary tables have been prepared for all future infrastructure for all LGIP networks identified 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 identify between the existing and future networks for each identified network. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	PFTI maps clearly identify both existing and future trunk infrastructure. Assets can clearly be distinguished.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	40.	The service catchments referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown	Yes	The service catchments are clearly identified on the relevant PFTI maps. Refer to the Local Government	Yes	Service catchments referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary are shown on the PFTI maps, with the full extent of service	N/A	LGIP may proceed	

		clearly on the maps.		Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme) and SOW model.		catchments shown in the Extrinsic Material for each network.		
	41.	Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legible map reference.	Yes	All future trunk infrastructure items have been identified on the relevant PFTI maps, including project references consistent with the schedule of works tables and SOW. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme) and the SOW model.	Yes	All future trunk infrastructure projects have been identified on the relevant PFTI maps with clear references to the Schedules of Works tables and SOW Model. To aid with interpretation, further clarity has been provided in the Schedules of Works and SOW Model by separating the future trunk infrastructure projects into the key relevant infrastructure items.	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	Project references have been used consistently on the PFTI maps, in the schedule of works tables, and in the SOW. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	All future trunk infrastructure projects can be identified by an LGIP ID, which is consistent between the PFTI map, Schedules of Works tables and SOW Model for each project. To aid with interpretation, further clarity has been provided in the Schedules of Works and SOW Model by separating the future trunk infrastructure projects into infrastructure items under the same LGIP ID.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
Schedules of works <i>[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]</i>	43.	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP complies with the LGIP template.	Yes	The schedule of works tables have been drafted consistent with the LGIP template. Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP are consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	44.	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.	Yes	The identified trunk infrastructure for the identified networks is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.	Yes	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the definition of trunk infrastructure in SPA and the table of indicative trunk and non-trunk infrastructure in Appendix B of the LGIP Guideline.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	45.	The existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA.	Yes	The existing and future trunk infrastructure networks have been prepared on the basis of the planning assumptions to meet the infrastructure demand projections based on ultimate development (the planned development capacity of the Ipswich Planning Scheme). Refer to the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Supporting Document – Planning Assumptions Summary Report Update 2016 for further details and Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).	Yes	Infrastructure planning has been undertaken for each network taking into consideration demand in each service catchment to Ultimate Development of the Planning Scheme.	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	Yes	The LTFF developed to demonstrate Council's capacity to manage the growth forecast in the LGIP is specifically informed by the cost estimates of the LGIP. It is also an intended outcome of the development of the LTFF that it sufficiently reflects an appropriate level of	Yes	Council has recognised the differences that exist between the demand (revenue) projections that underpin the LTFF versus those applied within the LGIP SoW model. Such differences are inevitable due to conflicting requirements between the <i>Local Government Regulation 2012, the Sustainable Planning Act</i> and LGIP Guidelines.	N/A	LGIP may proceed

			achieve this?		the asset maintenance and refurbishment to support the LGIP growth levels. The review of the LTAMP and underlying LTFF will be based on observed growth rates in future periods.		<p>Council has recognised that the revenue forecasts prepared for the LTFF are based on both the historical and foreseeable growth rates that do not align with the growth targets identified within the SEQ Regional Plan and therefore the LGIP.</p> <p>Given the intrinsic link between population and employment growth and necessary infrastructure to support this growth, the capital expenditure forecasting between these two documents will differ. As the Level of Service assumptions which underpin the infrastructure requirements in both processes are generally aligned, any differences will relate only to the forecasted timing of expenditure.</p> <p>The infrastructure costs that have been used in the LTFF capital works planning and the LGIP have been based on consistent approaches, utilising the same valuation assumptions and methodologies. Some projects within the LGIP are nominated a single year for provision, whilst in reality these would be staged over a number of financial years. For the purpose of providing a comparable assessment of the alignment between the LGIP and LTFF, a “smoothing” of the larger single expenditures has been performed.</p> <p>During LGIP review process, Council has provided modelled outputs of the LGIP revenue and expenditure forecasts using processes and producing the key indicators which are comparable to that required through the LTFF process. Council has, in scenario testing a higher growth rate, demonstrated that the increased capital works expenditure can be matched by increased revenues and debt serving capability. This is borne out in the financial ratios assessment which accompanied the reporting on the LTFF under the LGIP scenario.</p> <p>Council has adopted a prudent approach in line with actual revenue, given its obligations under the Local Government Act, however this can change as evidence of the SEQR growth materialises, at which time Council can respond accordingly. This review process has been identified by Council as an integral part of its future budget modelling.</p>		
		47.	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is consistent	Yes	The cost of the identified trunk infrastructure networks have been calculated consistent with the	Yes	Costs for existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables are consistent with legislative	N/A	LGIP may proceed

		with legislative requirements.		methodologies included in the LGIP guideline. Refer to the SOW model and the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment (Part 13 of the Ipswich Planning Scheme).		requirements under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act</i> . Further detail supporting the Costing approaches is provided in the Extrinsic Material for the respective infrastructure networks.		
SOW model	48.	The submitted SOW model is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline for LGIPs.	Yes	The SOW model template included with the statutory guideline was used as the basis for preparing the Local Government Infrastructure Plan Amendment. It has been prepared in Excel and modified to reflect elements of Ipswich City Council's infrastructure planning that are not provided for in the State government's SOW model (eg planning to ultimate development). The SOW model includes at least the same functionality as the State government's SOW model and is interactive.	Yes	The alternative to the State government SOW model prepared by Integran Pty Ltd includes the same functionally as the State's version. The model documents all input data including general inputs, unit rates of assets, demand forecasts, lists of assets and relevant catchments, charges calculations that provide transparency in the cost apportionment and derivation of charges, fully functional DCF calculations, and the required outputs including full schedules of works and summary cash flow projections.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	49.	The SOW model has been prepared and populated consistent with the statutory guideline for LGIPs and its User manual for the SOW model.	Yes	The modified SOW model has been populated in a way that is consistent with the LGIP guideline and SOW user manual.	Yes	The alternative to the State government SOW model was prepared and populated by Integran Pty Ltd. The model documents all input data including general inputs, unit rates of assets, 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. The on-cost allowances and contingency amounts provided for within the SoW model are within the ranges stipulated within the LGIP Statutory Guidelines. Land Values have been determined as a project cost, with further justification of the valuation basis provided for within the respective Extrinsic Material Documents for each network and the Land Valuation Study. The financial Inputs (i.e. escalation rates, Inflation rates, WACCs, etc) are consistent with typical rates used by Local Government in the preparation of Charging Frameworks. The basis for the adopted rates have been clearly explained and justified by Council during the LGIP review process and are considered appropriate for use.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
Extrinsic material	50.	All relevant background studies and reports in relation to the preparation of the LGIP are available and identified in the list of extrinsic material in the LGIP guideline.	Yes	All relevant extrinsic material (Supporting Documents and the SOW model) have been prepared to support the draft LGIP and are available (will be made available) in accordance with the LGIP guideline.	Yes	A comprehensive suite of Extrinsic Material Documents have been prepared by Council which provide the necessary background to the network planning, explanation of methodologies employed in producing the LGIP and other considerations for	N/A	LGIP may proceed

							<p>the Justification of the LGIP inputs.</p> <p>Extrinsic Material Documents have been prepared for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Valuation Study; • Planning Assumptions; • Transport Network; • Public Parks Network; and • Land for Community Facilities Network. 		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Ipswich City Council Post Public Consultation Statement

Ipswich City Council resolved to proceed with the LGIP Amendment on 19 September 2017 with no changes.

It is confirmed that the LGIP Amendment is not significantly different from the version that was provided for public consultation and it remains unchanged.