



Solutions
PLANNING INFRASTRUCTURE ECONOMICS

LGIP Reviewer Statement and Checklist – first review

Cassowary Coast
Regional Council

October 2018



PIE Solutions

Jason Miller

jason@piesolutions.com.au

Ph: 3177 3310

Mob: 0413 019 956

Document Control

Version	Date	Author	Reviewer
Final	4/10/2018	JM	

© 2018 PIE Solutions All Rights Reserved. Copyright in the whole and every part of this document belongs to PIE Solutions and may not be used, sold, transferred, copied or reproduced in whole or in part in any manner or form or in or on any media to any person without the prior written consent of PIE Solutions.

Table of Contents

1.0	BACKGROUND	1
2.0	COMPLIANCE CHECK PROCESS	1
3.0	COMPLIANCE CHECK METHODOLOGY	2
4.0	COMPLIANCE CHECK FINDINGS	2
5.0	CONCLUSIONS	2
6.0	CONDITIONS	2
7.0	RECOMMENDATION	2

1.0 Background

Cassowary Coast Regional Council (Council) is proposing a *Local Government Infrastructure Plan* (LGIP). Council decided to make the proposed LGIP under the superseded *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* and the first compliance check is to be undertaken in accordance with that legislative framework.

The LGIP will ultimately form part of Council’s planning scheme and will identify Council’s plans for trunk infrastructure that are necessary to service future urban development at the desired standard of service in a coordinated, efficient and financially sustainable manner.

In January 2018, Council appointed PIE Solutions to assist it in the preparation of its LGIP. Drafting of the LGIP was completed in August 2018 and Council endorsed the draft LGIP to proceed to its first compliance check and state interest review at its General Meeting held on 13 September 2018 (refer Appendix D).

PIE Solutions are pre-approved to undertake LGIP compliance checks by the *Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning* (DSDMIP) and have been engaged to undertake the first compliance check of the draft LGIP.

This report summarises the outcomes of this compliance check.

2.0 Compliance check process

The process used to undertake the compliance check comprised the following steps:

Stage	Description
<u>Engaged</u>	PIE Solutions were engaged to prepare and review Council’s LGIP in January 2018.
<u>Compliance check</u>	PIE Solutions was requested to undertake a first compliance check of the proposed LGIP on 25 September 2018. The compliance check was finalised on 4 October 2018.
<u>Written statement</u>	This written statement prepared by PIE Solutions was issued on 4 October 2018.

The following local government personnel were involved in the compliance check:

Name	Title	Date of discussion (s)	Scope of discussion
Justin Fischer	Manager Asset Engineering	Numerous meetings during preparation of LGIP and during	All aspects of the draft LGIP were discussed.

		compliance check.	
Geoffrey Smart	Manager Water	Meetings during preparation of LGIP	Water and sewerage aspects of the draft LGIP were discussed.

3.0 Compliance check methodology

PIE Solutions is required to:

1. Evaluate whether the proposed LGIP complies with the requirements of Statutory Guideline 01/16 – Making and amending local planning instruments and Statutory Guideline 04/14 – Local government infrastructure plans; and
2. Provide a written statement and the completed checklist to the local government detailing the findings of the compliance check.

4.0 Compliance check findings

PIE Solutions made the following first compliance check findings:

- In the process of preparing the proposed LGIP, Council has consulted with the following state agencies:
 - (a) Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR)
- Council has prepared a LGIP which is compliant with the requirements of the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*, Statutory Guideline 01/16, Statutory Guideline 03/14, the schedule of works model (SOW) and the LGIP checklist.
- Detailed commentary has been provided for each item of the LGIP checklist. This checklist is included as Appendix A to this report. A separate memorandum has been provided in relation to a review of the DSS and the outcomes of the SOW Model. These memorandums are Appendix B and Appendix C.

5.0 Conclusions

Council has prepared a LGIP which is compliant with the requirements of the of the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*, Statutory Guideline 01/16, Statutory Guideline 03/14, the schedule of works model (SOW) and the LGIP checklist.

6.0 Conditions

There are no conditions to be imposed.

7.0 Recommendation

PIE Solutions recommends to Council that the LGIP should **proceed unchanged**.

Appendix A
LGIP 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
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. 									
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	LGIP sections are ordered in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes.	LGIP sections are ordered in accordance with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		2.	The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme.	Yes	The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme.	Yes.	The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		3.	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Yes	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Yes.	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		4.	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Yes	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Yes	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions (to those in the QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements.	Yes	No additional definitions added.	Yes	No additional definitions added.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	Preliminary section	6.	The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		7.	All five trunk networks included in the LGIP. If not, which networks are excluded? Why have these networks been excluded?	Yes	All five trunk networks are included in the LGIP.	Yes	All five trunk networks are included in the LGIP.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	Planning assumptions - structure	8.	The drafting of the Planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The reference to a developable area map in clause 4.2.2(1) has been replaced with a definition of the developable area <i>"The developable area is the area zoned for urban purposes not affected by the development constraints stated in Table 3 – Development constraints."</i> This removes the need to prepare a map which duplicates the existing planning scheme overlay	Yes	The planning assumptions section has been drafted in accordance with the LGIP template. The only exception to this is 4.2.2(1) which provides a definition of the developable area with reference to the planning scheme overlays rather than a developable area map. The reasons provided by CCRC in support of the change are acceptable.	N/A	LGIP may proceed

				maps. The changes will also minimise the risk that users of the LGIP will assume that the area subject to constraints on the map is completely undevelopable. The proposed change does not detract from, and is consistent with the spirit of the LGIP template.					
		9.	All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa.	Yes	All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa.	Yes	All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa.	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	All the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant PFTI maps and vice versa.	Yes	The service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand (water supply, sewer, stormwater, transport and parks) are identified on the relevant PFTI maps and vice versa.	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 reflect those prepared in 2011 by the Qld Government Statistician and which were available to the CCRC when it began preparing its planning assumptions in 2015.	Yes	The population and dwelling projections reflect those prepared in 2011 by the Qld Government Statistician. The 2011 QGSO projections were the most recent available when the CCRC began preparing its planning assumptions in 2015.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		12.	The employment and non-residential development projections align with the available economic development studies, other reports about employment or historical rates for the area.	Yes	No economic development studies or other reports about employment have been prepared for the area. For this reason, a "status-quo" methodology was used by CCRC's consultant to calculate future employment targets using the current ratio of local jobs to population and to calculate future jobs distribution by industry by using the current distribution of jobs by industry.	Yes	As no studies had been undertaken to forecast future employment in the CCRC LGA, the "status-quo" method used by CCRC to calculate future employment targets is considered to be acceptable.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

		13.	The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding.	Yes	The extrinsic material explains that developable area has been calculated by removing the area of land subject to absolute development constraints from the area zoned for urban purposes.	Yes	The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints defined in the LGIP Planning Assumptions extrinsic material report. This is acceptable.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		14.	The planned densities reflect realistic levels and types of development having regard to the planning scheme provisions and current development trends.	Yes	The planned densities reflect realistic levels and types of development having regard to the planning scheme provisions and current development trends. This analysis was undertaken by CCRC's consultant and is documented in the report titled <i>CCRC Planning Assumptions Report, July 2016</i> .	Yes	CCRC has provided a summary explanation of its planned densities in the LGIP Planning Assumptions Extrinsic Material Report. The planned densities stated in Table 13 of the LGIP are considered to reflect realistic levels and types of development for each area classification.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	Planned densities have been applied in a manner which accounts for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	Planned densities account for local roads and other infrastructure. This is acceptable.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		16.	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the QPP definition.	Yes	The population and employment projections at ultimate development have been calculated with reference to the realistic planned densities.	Yes	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the QPP definition.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		17.	Based on the information in the projection tables and other available material, it is possible to verify the remaining capacity to accommodate growth, for each projection area.	Yes	Having regard to the ultimate development projections in the projection tables, it is verified that each projection area has capacity to accommodate growth.	Yes	The projection tables identify that each projection area has capacity to accommodate growth beyond the 15 year horizon of the PIA. This growth capacity can be quantified.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		18.	The planning assumptions reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	Future growth is confined to the existing urban area and its immediate periphery. The planning assumptions reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The planning assumptions demonstrate that growth will be confined to the existing urban area and its immediate periphery. This is considered to achieve an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		19.	Has the Department of Transport and main Roads or any relevant distributor-retailer	Yes	There is no relevant distributor-retailer.	Yes	DTMR have been consulted in the preparation of the	N/A	LGIP may proceed

		been consulted in the preparation of the LGIP? What was the outcome of the consultation?		DTMR have been consulted in the preparation of the LGIP. No objections were raised.		LGIP. No objections were raised by DTMR.		
Planning assumptions - demand	20.	The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of population and employment growth.	Yes	The projections of population and employment growth were converted into infrastructure demand using demand conversion rates calculated for each network.	Yes	The extrinsic material reports explain how population and employment growth projections have been converted into infrastructure demand projections. The methodology used is acceptable.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	21.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	Yes	Demand generation rates were calculated for the water and wastewater networks using water consumption data. Industry accepted rates for the roads, parks and stormwater networks were used.	Yes	An explanation of the demand generation rates used to calculate demand is provided in each of the network extrinsic material reports. This demonstrates that the demand generation rates have been calculated using appropriate CCRC data or are based on acceptable industry standards.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	22.	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	Yes	All the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant PFTI maps and vice versa.	Yes	Each of the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant PFTI maps and vice versa.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	23.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA.	Yes	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA.	Yes	The PIA covers properties which have been zoned for urban development within the Cassowary Coast local government area.	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	Asset Management Plans are currently being prepared by CCRC and will align with the LGIP projections of growth and demand. The Long Term Financial Forecast aligns with the LGIP projections of growth and demand.	Yes	CCRC are currently preparing asset management plans which will align with LGIP projections of growth and demand. Although CCRC does not have a LTFF, it does have a 10 year model which is consistent with the projections of growth and demand.	N/A	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.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

		26.	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	Yes	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	Yes	Text references to PIA map(s) 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	Map LGIP – 01 shows the PIA legible to the lot level and includes planning scheme zoning.	Yes	The PIA is legible to the lot level and includes the planning scheme zoning.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		28.	The PIA includes all areas of existing urban development serviced by all relevant trunk infrastructure networks at the time the LGIP was prepared.	Yes	The PIA includes all areas of existing urban development serviced by 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.	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 for 15 years (2016-2031).	Yes	The PIA can accommodate 15 years of growth.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		30.	Are there areas outside the PIA for which the planning assumptions identify urban growth within the next 10 to 15 years? If so, why have these areas been excluded from the PIA?	Yes	There are no areas outside the PIA that the planning assumptions identify as being subject to urban growth.	Yes	The PIA is capable of accommodating future growth and there are no areas outside the PIA that the planning assumptions identify as being subject to urban growth.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		31.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	Future growth is confined to the existing urban area and its immediate periphery and is reflected in the PIA boundary. This reflects an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The planning assumptions demonstrate that growth will be confined to the existing urban area and its immediate periphery (the PIA). This is considered to achieve an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	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 drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	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 DSS section states the key planning and design standards for each network.	Yes.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		34.	The DSS reflects the key, high level industry standards, regulatory and statutory guidelines and codes, and planning scheme policies about infrastructure.	Yes	The DSS for each network is consistent with applicable industry and national standards and compare favourably to the standards adopted by other local governments in Queensland.	Yes	A review of the DSS used by CCRC against those used by other local governments demonstrates that the DSS are comparable. The review is documented in Appendix B - <i>Memorandum CCRC LGIP Preparation dated 4 October 2018.</i>	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		35.	There is alignment between the relevant levels of service stated in the local	Yes	CCRC is currently preparing Asset Management Plans and will ensure alignment	Yes	CCRC has advised that it is currently preparing asset management plans which	N/A	LGIP may proceed

			government's Long Term Asset Management Plan (LTAMP) and the LGIP. If not, is there a process underway to achieve this?		between the relevant levels of service stated in these plans and the LGIP.		will align with the LGIP. This is acceptable.		
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 PFTI section has been drafted consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	37.	PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes	N/A	Yes	PFTI maps have been identified for water supply, sewerage, stormwater, transport and parks & land for community facilities networks.	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	N/A	Yes	PFTI schedule of works have been identified for water supply, sewerage, stormwater, transport and parks & land for community facilities networks.	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	N/A	Yes	Existing and future trunk infrastructure in each network is clearly identified.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	40.	The service catchments referenced in the SOW model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown clearly on the maps.	Yes	N/A	Yes	The service catchments are shown on the relevant PFTI maps.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	41.	Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legible map reference.	Yes	N/A	Yes	The future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legible map reference.	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	N/A	Yes	The infrastructure map reference is shown in the SOW model and summary schedule of works table in the LGIP.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
Schedules of works	43.	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP complies with the LGIP template.	Yes	N/A	Yes	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP complies with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed	
	44.	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.	Yes	N/A	Yes	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and 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 identified in the LGIP is adequate to service at least the area of the PIA.	Yes	The infrastructure planning referenced in the extrinsic reports demonstrate that the existing and future trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP is adequate to	N/A	LGIP may proceed	

						service at least the area of the PIA.			
		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.	CCRC is currently preparing asset management plans and will ensure alignment with the Schedule of Works of the LGIP. Works identified within the LGIP are also included in Council's published capital works program.	Yes	CCRC has advised that it is currently preparing asset management plans which will align with the LGIP.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
		47.	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is consistent with legislative requirements.	Yes.	The establishment cost of trunk infrastructure has been calculated in accordance with the definition contained in the Planning Act 2016.	Yes	Costs, including on-cost and contingency rates, are consistent with the rates in the statutory guideline.	N/A	LGIP may proceed
	SOW model	48.	The submitted SOW model is consistent with the model included with the statutory guideline for LGIPs.	Yes.	N/A	Yes	The submitted SOW has the same functionality as the SOW model included in the statutory guideline. The outcomes of the SOW Model are documented in Appendix C - Memorandum CCRC SOW Model Outputs dated 4 October 2018.	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.	N/A	Yes	The inputs to the SOW Model are consistent with the statutory guideline.	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.	Extrinsic material reports have been prepared for the Planning Assumptions as well as the infrastructure networks. These reports detail the inputs used to prepare the assumptions and undertake the network planning.	Yes	Extrinsic material reports have been prepared for Planning Assumptions and all infrastructure networks which detail how inputs were prepared.	N/A	LGIP may proceed



Memorandum – CCRC LGIP Preparation

MEMORANDUM – CCRC LGIP Preparation

To:	Justin Fischer
From:	PIE Solutions Pty Ltd
Prepared by:	Jason Miller
Date:	4 October 2018
Subject:	Desired Standards of Service Comparison
CC:	

1.0 Desired Standards of Service Comparison

As part of the preparation of its local government infrastructure plan (LGIP), Cassowary Coast Regional Council (CCRC) wishes to ensure that the Desired Standards of Service (DSS) it uses to undertake infrastructure planning are reflective of industry standards and the standards used by other local governments.

To achieve this outcome, a high level comparison of the key DSS design criteria used by CCRC for its Water Supply, Sewerage, Roads, Stormwater and Parks and Land for Community Facilities networks was benchmarked against the criteria used by six other local governments.

Despite key design criteria used in the benchmarking exercise not being readily available for some local governments, the exercise was still considered to yield usable conclusions. These conclusions have been summarised below.

Water Supply Network

CCRC uses key design criteria stated in the FNQROC Development Manual. These key design criteria are similar to those used by the comparison North Queensland local governments and are based on accepted industry standards.

Sewerage Network

CCRC uses key design criteria stated in the FNQROC Development Manual. These key design criteria are similar to those used by the comparison North Queensland local governments and are based on accepted industry standards.

Roads

The Roads network was the most difficult network to compare across local governments. This is because many local governments reference codes used by other organisations and are not readily available to review. Where this has occurred, the comparison table has been left blank. Notwithstanding this difficulty, the average annual daily traffic thresholds used by CCRC to define arterial, sub-arterial and major collector roads was found to be similar to those use by the comparison North Queensland local governments.

Stormwater

CCRC states that its key design criteria are in accordance with QUDM, FNQROC and National Water Quality Guidelines. Similar statements are made in the DSS of the comparison North Queensland local governments.

Parks

CCRC uses key design criteria that are similar to those used by the comparison North Queensland local governments. In this regard, the rate of provision, park size, accessibility, flood immunity and slope reflect commonly accepted industry standards.

Land for Community Facilities

Unlike most of the comparison local governments, CCRC states the rate of provision and minimum size of land for community facilities. The rate of provision of local, district and local government wide land for community facilities is higher in CCRC than the only other local government (Cairns Regional Council) which provides this information.

A detailed analysis of each design criteria is included as Attachment 1 to this memorandum.

2.0 Conclusion

The DSS currently being used by CCRC are considered to be reflective of industry standards and the standards used by other local governments. The DSS are considered suitable for use in the proposed LGIP.

Water Supply Network Desired Standard of Service Comparison Table

Council Name	Average Day Demand	Peaking Factor	DSS for Mains		Firefighting Requirements	Source
			Minimum pressure	service pressure		
Cassowary Regional Council	500L/EP/day	2.25 x AD	22m head at peak hourly consumption	Residential (i.e. Residential dwellings of a maximum of 3 storeys)	15L/s for 2 hrs	FNQROC DEVELOPMENT MANUAL DESIGN MANUAL D6 – 03/17 Water Reticulation Design Manual
				Commercial (i.e. Shop and office accommodation of a maximum of 3 storeys) and Industrial	30L/s for 4 hrs	
				High Risk (i.e. A development where there is a probability of a fire occurring or there is high cost of resultant damage (personal injury or property))	To be determined in consultation with council. Alternative methods of provision may be required (i.e. on-site storage).	
				Residual pressure is to be 12 m minimum at an adjacent hydrant at the required background demand time, assuming that the elevation of the supply point is equal to the ground elevation at the hydrant. 6m minimum residual pressure is to be retained in the mains for all other areas of the water supply zone at the required background demand time. Positive residual pressures must exist at peak hour, within the reticulation during the fire event.		
Hinchinbrook Shire Council	450L / EP/ day	2.25 x AD	22m head under peak demand	Ingham CBD	15 L/s	Draft Hinchinbrook Regional Council LGIP – last accessed 18 April 2018
				Rural areas (excluding Trebonne and Taylors Beach)	7.5 L/s	
				Minimum residual mains pressure during firefighting conditions	12m head	
				Background demand	2/3 peak demand	
Cairns Regional Council	400L / EP /day	2.25x AD	22m at property boundary	Minimum residual mains pressure during firefighting conditions	12m min in main at the flowing hydrant 6m elsewhere in mains that have customer connections	Draft CTM Water Alliance Design and Construction Code, Addenda to SEQ Water Supply and

Council Name	Average Day Demand	Peaking Factor	DSS for Mains		Firefighting Requirements	Source
			Minimum service pressure			
					Positive pressure throughout Rural and small communities: Rural residential only: 7.5L/s for 2 hrs Rural commercial/industrial: 15L/s for 2 hrs Urban: Residential up to 3 stories: 15L/s for 2 hrs Commercial industrial: 30L/s for 4hrs Background demand: 2/3 peak hour	Sewerage Design and Construction Code (SEQ WS&S D&C Code) May 2015
Whitsunday Regional Council	500 L/EP/Day	2.25 x AD	220 kPa at each property boundary	Urban	Residential: 15 L/S for 2hrs Commercial/industrial: 30 L/S for 4hrs	Draft Whitsunday Regional Council LGIP V1.5
Townsville Regional Council	Residential: 670L/EP/D Industrial and Park: 200L/EP/D	1.875 x AD	22m at property boundary	Minimum residual mains pressure during firefighting conditions Rural and small communities Urban Background demand	12m min in main at the flowing hydrant 6m elsewhere in mains that have customer connections Positive pressure throughout Rural residential only: 7.5L/s for 2 hrs Rural commercial/industrial: 15L/s for 2 hrs Rural Residential: 7.5L/s Residential: 15 L/S for 2hrs Commercial/industrial: 30 L/S for 4hrs and achieving 12m at hydrant PH background apart from areas with less than 2000 EP then 2/3 PH	Draft CTM Water Alliance Design and Construction Code, Addenda to SEQ Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Code (SEQ WS&S D&C Code) May 2015
Mackay Regional Council	340L/EP/D	2 x AD	22m at each property boundary	Minimum residual mains pressure during firefighting conditions	12m min in main at the flowing hydrant 6m elsewhere in mains that have customer connections Positive pressure throughout	Draft CTM Water Alliance Design and Construction Code, Addenda to SEQ Water Supply and Sewerage Design and

Sewer Network Desired Standard of Service Comparison Table

Council Name	Average dry weather flow (ADWF) per EP	Peak wet weather flow (PWWF)	Maximum depth of flow at PWWF for gravity sewers	Maximum rising main velocity	Source
Cassowary Regional Council	270 L/EP/day	5 x ADWF or C1 x ADWF whichever is greater (4xADWF for Smart Sewers)	Max Flow depth shall not exceed ¾ pipe full	2.5m/s	FNQROC Development Manual D7 – 03/17 Sewerage System Design Manual
Hinchinbrook Shire Council	230L/EP/Day in Ingham catchment 130 L/EP/Day in Lucinda catchment	5 x ADWF	Up to 75% of full pipe diameter	Not stated	Draft Hinchinbrook Regional Council LGIP – last accessed 18 April 2018
Cairns Regional Council	270L/EP/Day	5 x ADWF or C1 x ADWF whichever is greater	*Max Flow depth shall not exceed ¾ pipe full	2.5m/s	Draft CTM Water Alliance Design and Construction Code, Addenda to SEQ Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Code (SEQ WS&S D&C Code) May 2015 *FNQROC Development Manual D7 – 03/17 Sewerage System Design Manual
Townsville Regional Council	230L/EP/Day	5 x ADWF	75% of pipe diameter at PWWF	2.5m/s	Draft CTM Water Alliance Design and Construction Code, Addenda to SEQ Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Code (SEQ WS&S D&C Code) May 2015
Mackay Regional Council	230L/EP/Day	5 x ADWF	Flows not to exceed 70% of pipe diameter to allow for ventilation and free air flow above the sewer	2.0 m/s	Mackay Region Planning Scheme 2017 Version 1.1

Council Name	Average weather dry flow (ADWF) per EP	Peak wet weather flow (PWWF)	Maximum depth of flow at PWWF for gravity sewers	Maximum rising main velocity	Source
Whitsunday Regional Council	270 L/EP/Day	5 x ADWF OR C1 x ADWF (whichever is greater)	Air space of at least 75% of pipe diameter at design flow	Maximum velocity: 2.5 m/s	Draft Whitsunday Regional Council LGIP V1.5
Tablelands Regional Council	275 L/EP/day	The design flow adopted shall be limited to (4xADWF).	The sewer capacity at design flow should not exceed 0.75 x diameter of sewer.	*Maximum velocity 2.5m/s	Part 4 Priority Infrastructure Plan, Tablelands Regional Council Planning Scheme 2016 *FNQROC Development Manual D7 – 03/17 Sewerage System Design Manual

Road Network Desired Standard of Service Comparison Table

Council Name	Road type	Design Speed	Volume to Capacity			Average annual daily traffic			Intersection spacing	Direct Access	Preferred intersection	Carriageway width (m)
			Rural	Suburban	Inner Urban	Rural	Suburban	Inner urban				
*Cassowary Coast Regional Council	Arterial 4 lane	60					>6000				2 x 8.5	
	Arterial 2 lane	60					>6000				2 x 5.5	
	Collector (Major)	60					3000-5999				11 (4 lane)	
Hinchinbrook Shire Council	Significant local road	80-100					Not stated					
	Rural collector/distributor	60-80					Not stated					
	Urban collector/distributor and Urban arterial	60					>3000					
*Cairns Regional Council	Arterial - 4 lane	60					>6000				2 x 8.5	
	Arterial - 2 lane	60					>6000				2 x 5.5	
	Collector (Major)	60					3000-5999				11 (4 lane)	
Toowoomba Regional Council	Highway	100 kph	0.5	0.6	0.65				5km	None	Grade separated	3.5 per lane
	Regional Arterial	80	0.5	0.6	0.65				1km	None	Signals or roundabout depending on flow distribution and pedestrian/cycle movements	3.5 per lane
	Sub Arterial	80	0.6	0.65	0.70				500m	Limited building address only and not within 60m of intersections	Signals or roundabout depending on flow distribution and pedestrian/cycle movements	3.5 per lane

Council Name	Road type	Design Speed	Volume to Capacity			Average annual daily traffic			Intersection spacing	Direct Access	Preferred intersection	Carriageway width (m)
			Rural	Suburban	Inner Urban	Rural	Suburban	Inner urban				
	Distributor	80	0.65	0.70	0.75				200 m	Limited to building address only and not within 40 m of intersections	Priority tee but controlled depending on flow distribution and pedestrian and cycle movements.	3.5 per lane
#Mackay Regional Council	Arterial	80-100	0.85	0.85	0.85		>20,000		>1000m	Nil	Grade separated/signal/roundabout	3.5 per lane
	Sub Arterial	80-1000	0.85	0.85	0.85		<10,000		>300m	Accepted with conditions	Roundabout / priority	3.0 per lane
	Major Collector		0.85	0.85	0.85		<6,000		>100	Consolidated	Priority	3.0 per lane
Whitsunday Regional Council	Arterial		0.8	0.8								
	Sub Arterial		0.8	0.8								
	Major collector		0.8	0.8								

* FNQROC Regional Development Manual Version 7 (2017)

Planning Scheme Policy SC6.5 Mackay Region Planning Scheme2017 Version 1.1

Park Network Desired Standard of Service Comparison Table

Council Name	Park land rate of provision					Rate of Provision Summary	Notes
	Local Recreation	District Recreation	Metropolitan Recreation	District Sport	Metropolitan Sport		
Cassowary Coast Regional Council	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	4.0/1000	Part 4 LGIP, Cassowary Coast Regional Council Planning Scheme
Hinchinbrook Shire Council	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1		0.8/1000	Draft Hinchinbrook Regional Council LGIP
Cairns Regional Council	1.0	1.3	0.2	1.6	0.4	4.5/1000	Part 4 Local Government Infrastructure Plan, Cairns Plan Version 1.2 2016
Toowoomba Regional Council	0.7	2.2	1.0	1.3	0.5	4.7/1000	Part 4 Local Government Infrastructure Plan, Toowoomba Regional Council Planning Scheme
Tablelands Regional Council	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.4	3.9/1000	Part 4 Priority Infrastructure Plan, Tablelands Regional Council Planning Scheme 2016
Whitsunday Regional Council	NA	0.5	0.8	1.2	1.0	3.5/1000	Draft Whitsunday Regional Council LGIP V1.5

Council Name	Park land rate of provision					Rate of Provision Summary	Notes
	Local Recreation	District Recreation	Metropolitan Recreation	District Sport	Metropolitan Sport		
Cassowary Coast Regional Council	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	4.0/1000	Part 4 LGIP, Cassowary Coast Regional Council Planning Scheme
Hinchinbrook Shire Council	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1		0.8/1000	Draft Hinchinbrook Regional Council LGIP
Cairns Regional Council	1.0	1.3	0.2	1.6	0.4	4.5/1000	Part 4 Local Government Infrastructure Plan, Cairns Plan Version 1.2 2016
Toowoomba Regional Council	0.7	2.2	1.0	1.3	0.5	4.7/1000	Part 4 Local Government Infrastructure Plan, Toowoomba Regional Council Planning Scheme
Tablelands Regional Council	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.4	3.9/1000	Part 4 Priority Infrastructure Plan, Tablelands Regional Council Planning Scheme 2016
Whitsunday Regional Council	NA	0.5	0.8	1.2	1.0	3.5/1000	Draft Whitsunday Regional Council LGIP V1.5

Council Name	Minimum Park Size				
	Local Recreation	District Recreation	Metropolitan Recreation	District Sport	Metropolitan Sport
Cassowary Coast Regional Council	0.5	2.0	2.0	5.0	5.0
Hinchinbrook Shire Council	0.6	1.0	10.0	1.0	10.0
Cairns Regional Council	Standalone –0.5 Ha (1.0 Ha preferred) Rec node 7 – 0.2 Ha	Standalone – 2-5 Ha Rec Node – 2 Ha	Standalone – Not specific, depends on key features. Rec Node – 5 Ha	10.0	20.0
Toowoomba Regional Council	0.5	2.0	Variable (regional parks are unique and not tied to specific size other than population needs)	6.0	Sized as required to meet provision standards
Tablelands Regional Council	0.5 Ha (1.0 Ha if a node)	2 Ha usable area	More than 5 Ha	5.0	5 - 10
Whitsunday Regional Council	NA	4.0	13.0	6.0	18.0

Council Name	Park accessibility - distance (km)				
	Local Recreation	District Recreation	Metropolitan Recreation	District Sport	Metropolitan Sport
Cassowary Coast Regional Council	0.5	10-15 min drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to arterial road or to future arterial road; and • 10-20 minute drive 	10-15 min drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to arterial road or to future arterial road; and • 10-20 minute drive
Hinchinbrook Shire Council	< 0.5	< 2.5	< 60	< 60	< 60
Cairns Regional Council	0.4 – 0.5	2-5	10-20	5-15	15-30
Toowoomba Regional Council	0.4	1.0	Centrally located to serve entire region including urban, township and rural catchments	20.0	Centrally located to serve entire region including urban, township and rural catchments
Tablelands Regional Council	0.5	2 - 5	>5	5	5-10
Whitsunday Regional Council	NA	2	25	5	10

Council Name	Minimum Post-Development Flood Immunity					Maximum Slope				
	Local Recreation	District Recreation	Metropolitan Recreation	District Sport	Metropolitan Sport	Local Recreation	District Recreation	Metropolitan Recreation	District Sport	Metropolitan Sport
Cassowary Coast Regional Council	New buildings and hard standing areas are above the 1% annual exceedance probability level for flooding.			fields/courts are above the 2% annual exceedance probability level for flooding		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1:20 for main use area; and • 1:6 for remainder. 	20 for main use area; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1:50 for kick about area; and • no maximum slope specified for all other areas 		1:50 for all playing surfaces	
Hinchinbrook Shire Council	Ensure land is of an appropriate size, configuration and slope, and has an acceptable level of flood immunity. Maximise opportunities to co-locate recreational parks in proximity to other community infrastructure, transport hubs and valued environmental and cultural assets.									
Cairns Regional Council	Whole area free of regular flooding (i.e.: above ARI 5) with the Main Purpose Area or 10 % (whichever is the greater) of total area above ARI 50. Free of hazards		Free of hazards. Facilities above ARI 100 At least 50% of park to be above ARI 50	Main sporting use areas above ARI 50. Total area to be above ARI 5. Built Facilities above ARI 100. Free of hazards	Free of hazards. Fields/ courts above ARI 50. Built Facilities above ARI 100	1: 20 for main use area 1: 6 for remainder	1: 20 for main use area Variable topography for remainder	Use areas 1: 20	1: 50 for field and court areas 1: 10 elsewhere	1: 50 for all playing surfaces
Toowoomba Regional Council	15% above Q15 10% above Q50 5% above Q100	40% above Q15 20% above Q50 10% above Q100	60% above Q15 40% above Q50 30% above Q100	80% above Q15 70% above Q50 25% above Q100		1:30 for 80% of site	1:30 for 70% of site and >1:30 of 30% of site	N/A	1:100 for all playing surfaces and 1:30 for remaining 70% of the park area 30% of the land outside of any playing surface may have a gradient greater than 1:30 but less than 1:6 for maintenance purposes	

Council Name	Minimum Post-Development Flood Immunity					Maximum Slope				
	Local Recreation	District Recreation	Metropolitan Recreation	District Sport	Metropolitan Sport	Local Recreation	District Recreation	Metropolitan Recreation	District Sport	Metropolitan Sport
Tablelands Regional Council	25% above Q5 75% above Q50	90% above Q50 10% above Q100	50% above Q5 40% above Q50 10% above Q100	90% above Q50 10% above Q100	50% above Q5 40% above Q50 10% above Q100	1:20 for main use area 1:6 for remainder	1:20 for main use area, variable for remainder	1:20 for use areas variable for remainder	1:50 for field and court areas 1:10 for remainder	1:50 for all playing surfaces
Whitsunday Regional Council	NA	20% > Q50 10% > Q100	50% > Q50 20% > Q100	Fields and courts > Q50 Built facilities > Q100	NA	NA	Max grade 1:10 for 80% of park, 1:14 where possible	Average grade 1:20 1:50 for kickabout areas	1:80 for all playing surfaces	1:100 for all playing surfaces

Land for Community Facilities Desired Standard of Service Comparison Table

Council Name	Minimum size (ha)		Rate provision of Ha/1000 persons	Rate provision of Facility/ persons	Minimum Flood Immunity	Max grade	Accessibility (residents)	Source
Cassowary Coast Regional Council	Local	NA	1.25/100	NA	Co-location with existing parks, services and facilities is preferred. Useable areas, including areas for buildings and structures, are in accordance with the requirements of this planning scheme and the Building Act 1975.	Not stated	Not Stated	Part 4 LGIP, Cassowary Coast Regional Council Planning Scheme
	District	0.25	1.25/1000	NA				
	Local Government wide	1.0	1.25/1000	NA				
Hinchinbrook Shire Council	District	Not Stated						Draft Hinchinbrook Regional Council LGIP
	City							
Cairns Regional Council	Local	NA	NA	Not stated	Whole of site to be above ARI 100. Free of Hazards.	1:20 max slope	NA	Part 4 Local Government Infrastructure Plan, Cairns Plan Version 1.2 2016
	District	Cultural Activity Space (CAS) 1500m2 Community Meeting & Activity Space (CMS) 2000m2 Community Service Facility (CSF)	0.15/1000				5.0	

Council Name	Minimum size (ha)		Rate provision of Ha/1000 persons	Rate provision of Facility/ persons	Minimum Flood Immunity	Max grade	Accessibility (residents)	Source
		1000m2 Formal Memorial Space (FMS) 1000m2						
	Citywide	CAS 1 Ha CMS 1 Ha CSF 1 Ha FMS 10 Ha	0.15 Ha/1000				15-30	
Toowoomba Regional Council	Not stated		Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Part 4 Local Government Infrastructure Plan, Toowoomba Regional Council Planning Scheme
Tablelands Regional Council	Not stated		Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Part 4 Priority Infrastructure Plan, Tablelands Regional Council Planning Scheme 2016
Whitsunday Regional Council	Not stated		Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Not stated	Draft Whitsunday Regional Council LGIP V1.5

Memorandum – CCRC SOW Model Outputs

Memorandum – CCRC SOW Model

To:	Cassowary Coast Regional Council
From:	PIE Solutions
Prepared by:	Damon Ehlers
Date:	4 October 2018
Subject:	Cassowary Coast Regional Council – Local government infrastructure plan schedule of works model
CC:	

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a summary of the outputs of the schedule of works (SOW) model prepared in support of the draft Cassowary Coast Regional Council (Council) local government infrastructure plan (LGIP).

Background

- Council are preparing a LGIP consistent with the requirements of the *Planning Act 2016* (PA).
- As part of the preparation of their LGIP, Council must prepare a schedule of works (SOW) model which facilitates a projection of revenue from infrastructure charges and analysis of future expenditure on trunk infrastructure.
- The purpose of the SOW model is to enable Council to demonstrate that it can fund the infrastructure it proposes to deliver in its LGIP.
- All inputs to the SOW model have been sourced from the draft LGIP and supporting extrinsic material reports.

Projected infrastructure charges revenue

A projection of revenue received through infrastructure charges was prepared by multiplying expected development in the Cassowary Coast region by the infrastructure charge rates contained within the draft *Cassowary Coast Regional Council Infrastructure Charges Resolution 2018*.

To account for increases in the infrastructure charge over the 15-year life of the LGIP, the infrastructure charge was assumed to increase at a rate consistent with the *Producer Price Index (road and bridge construction)* published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. A 10-year average of the index (2.37% p.a.) was adopted for this purpose.

In net present value (NPV) terms, it is expected that Council will collect approximately \$2.7m in infrastructure charges from development occurring within its local government area. Projected revenue has been detailed in Table 1.

Table 1 - Projected infrastructure charges revenue

Development Type	NPV	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Detached Dwelling	\$2,488,139	\$209,686	\$214,655	\$219,743	\$224,950	\$230,282	\$229,368	\$234,804	\$240,369	\$246,066	\$251,897	\$265,030	\$271,312	\$277,742	\$284,324	\$291,063
Attached Dwelling	\$258,404	\$20,240	\$20,720	\$21,211	\$21,713	\$22,228	\$27,306	\$27,953	\$28,615	\$29,294	\$29,988	\$25,582	\$26,188	\$26,809	\$27,444	\$28,095
Commercial	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Community purpose	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Industry	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Retail	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$2,746,543	\$229,926	\$235,375	\$240,953	\$246,664	\$252,510	\$256,674	\$262,757	\$268,984	\$275,359	\$281,885	\$290,613	\$297,500	\$304,551	\$311,769	\$319,158

Projected expenditure on trunk infrastructure

The costs of delivering the trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP were modelled over the LGIP planning horizon.

To account for increases in the costs of constructing infrastructure over the 15-year life of the LGIP, establishment costs of future infrastructure were assumed to increase at a rate consistent with the *Producer Price Index (road and bridge construction)* published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. A 10-year average of the index (2.37% p.a.) was adopted for this purpose.

In net present value (NPV) terms, it is expected that Council will expend approximately \$36.8 million on trunk infrastructure over the life of the LGIP within its local government area. This expenditure has been detailed in Table 2.

This projected expenditure aligns with expenditure anticipated within Council's capital works program.

Table 2 - Projected expenditure on trunk infrastructure

Development Type	NPV	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Water Supply	\$29,131,420	\$6,617,585	\$3,570,837	\$8,381,044	\$1,107,263	\$6,480,134	\$0	\$9,053,532	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sewer	\$2,218,665	\$393,952	\$0	\$385,700	\$1,841,784	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Stormwater	\$1,026,252	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,223,723	\$2,295,747	\$99,838	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Transport	\$2,723,578	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,636,499	\$0	\$939,650	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Parks and Community Facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$36,806,199	\$7,011,536	\$3,570,837	\$8,766,744	\$2,949,047	\$10,340,356	\$2,295,747	\$10,093,021	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Revenue shortfall

As can be noted in Table 1 and Table 2, there is a shortfall of \$34.1m (in NPV terms) between Council's projected revenue from infrastructure charges and its expected expenditure on trunk infrastructure.

It is recognised however that as a low growth local government, Council does not rely on revenue received through infrastructure charges to fund the delivery of trunk infrastructure. It is also noted that the works within the LGIP relate to delivering improvements to standards of service rather than being driven by growth.

Instead, Council typically relies on a combination of general rates revenue and funding received through State and Federal Government programs to deliver significant infrastructure works within the local government. It is expected that this shortfall will be funded through these sources.

4. REGIONAL PLANNING

4.1 DRAFT LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

Author & Officer's Title: Daniel Horton - Manager Planning Services

Meeting Date: 13 September 2018

Attachment 1: Draft Local Government Infrastructure Plan

Attachment 2: Extract from Statutory Guideline 01/16

Executive Summary:

By legislation, Council is required to have an adopted Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) in place to continue to levy infrastructure charges or impose conditions about trunk infrastructure on applicable development approvals.

Council is in the process of finalising a draft LGIP under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009.

Once adopted, the LGIP will form part of the Cassowary Coast Regional Council Planning Scheme 2016 and identifies Council's plans for trunk infrastructure that is necessary to service future urban development at the desired standard of service in a coordinated, efficient and financially sustainable manner.

To expedite the completion of the LGIP, it is recommended that Council delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to undertake all statutory steps, under the (repealed) Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and Statutory Guideline 01/16, to complete and adopt the LGIP.

Recommendation:

“That Council:

- 1. Receive and note the draft Cassowary Coast Regional Council Local Government Infrastructure Plan as attached (Attachment 1) to this report.**
 - 2. Delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer to undertake all statutory steps, under the (repealed) Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and Statutory Guideline 01/16, to complete and adopt the Cassowary Coast Regional Council Local Government Infrastructure Plan.**
 - 3. Instruct Council officers to submit a report to Council detailing the steps taken to complete and adopt the Cassowary Coast Regional Council Local Government Infrastructure Plan following the adoption of the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.”**
-

Background:

The LGIP details Council's plans to deliver new trunk infrastructure to service the Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA) for the period 2016 to 2031 for the following infrastructure networks:

- Water supply
- Sewerage
- Stormwater
- Transport
- Parks and land for community facilities

Trunk Infrastructure is higher order infrastructure which services multiple users, examples of trunk infrastructure include:

- In the water supply network - water treatment facilities, water storage facilities, pumping stations and higher order water distribution mains.
- In the sewerage network - sewerage treatment plants, sewer pump stations, rising mains and higher order gravity mains.
- In the stormwater network - stormwater channels, stormwater culverts and pipes and stormwater detention basins.
- In the transport network - arterial roads, sub-arterial roads and major distributor roads.
- In the parks and land for community facilities network - local, district and regional recreation and sporting parks.

The PIA is the area that Council intends to service with trunk infrastructure of the 15-year planning horizon of the LGIP. For Cassowary Coast Regional Council, the PIA covers all properties which are zoned for urban development. Whilst most properties within the PIA are serviced by all five trunk infrastructure networks, some properties within the PIA will not be serviced by the sewerage network over the 15-year LGIP planning horizon.

An infrastructure charge may be imposed as part of a development approval where the development will result in additional demand on Council's trunk infrastructure networks. Where Council imposes an infrastructure charge, it must do so in accordance with its infrastructure charges resolution.

Council use to be able to impose infrastructure charges in accordance with the *Adopted Infrastructure Charges Resolution No.1 of 2015*, however as the LGIP has not been adopted under the legislation Council cannot charge infrastructure charges.

Link to Corporate Plan:

Goal 3 - Sustainable Infrastructure

- 3.1. A safe, reliable and financially sustainable transport network throughout the Cassowary Coast to facilitate getting people and goods around our community.
- 3.3. Provide and manage cost effective and efficient water supply and sewerage infrastructure, which provides for growth while being environmentally sustainable.

Consultation:

Asset Engineering (Lead Role)
Pie Solutions (LGIP Consultants)

Legal Implications (Statutory basis, legal risks):

Nil

Policy Implications:

Statutory Guideline 01/16: Making and amending local planning instruments establishes the process for making or amending a planning scheme for a local government infrastructure plan.

An extract of the LGIP preparation process is included as **Attachment 2**.

The draft Cassowary Coast Regional Council LGIP will be provided to an appointed reviewer and informally reviewed by the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Following completion of the review, the draft LGIP will be formally submitted to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning for review and approval to publicly consult the LGIP.

To expedite all remaining LGIP steps, delegated authority is sought for the Chief Executive Officer to allow the LGIP steps to proceed without further Council resolution/s being required.

Risk Implications (Corporate, Operational, Project risks):

By legislation, Council is required to have an adopted LGIP in place to continue to levy infrastructure charges or impose conditions about trunk infrastructure on applicable development approvals.

Financial & Resource Implications:

The preparation of the LGIP is included in the 2018/19 budget.

Report prepared by:

Daniel Horton - Manager Planning Services

Report authorised by:

Manfred Boldy - Director Planning and Regional Development

Report created date:

5 September 2018