Appointed reviewer statement template

Approved form MGR5.2 under the Planning Act 2016

First Compliance check of Ipswich City Council local government infrastructure plan

Prepared by: Morgan Wilson Planning Consultant

Version	Date	Reviewer name and signature
Final For Council Endorsement 1.0	09/03/2023	Morgan Wilson 

The *Planning Act 2016* is administered by the Department of Local Government, Infrastructure and Planning, Queensland Government

Introduction

Morgan Wilson Planning Consultant has been engaged by Ipswich City Council to undertake a first compliance check of its proposed Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) or amendment to a current LGIP.

Morgan Wilson Planning Consultant is required to:

(1) evaluate whether a proposed LGIP or amendment complies with the requirements outlined under the *Planning Act 2016* and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules, including:
   (a) the SOW model requirements in Schedule 7 of the Guideline and Rules;
   (b) the LGIP template;
   (c) the approved form MGR5.1 – LGIP Review Checklist; and

(2) comply with the fundamental ethical principles of integrity, objectivity, professional competence, due care and professional behaviour when reviewing the LGIP; and

(3) provide a written statement and the completed checklist to the local government detailing the findings of the compliance check.

Scope exclusions

The following items are outside the scope of this review:

- A verification of the accuracy of individual inputs used in the preparation of an LGIP.
- A review of the local government's Long Term Financial Forecast (LTFF) or asset management plan (AMP) other than to determine the extent of their alignment with the LGIP.

Compliance check process

The process used for the compliance check is as follows:

Stage	Description
Engaged	• Documents and other information requested from Ipswich City Council on 30 November 2022, • Documents and other information provided by Ipswich City Council on 2 December 2022
Review	• Review commenced on 5 December 2022 • Additional information requested on 19/12/2022 and received on 23/12/2022 • Additional information requested on 3/01/2023 and received on 05/01/2023 • Meeting held with local government on 06/01/2023 • Meeting held with local government on 11/01/2023 • Meeting held with local government on 17/01/2023 • Meeting held with local government on 25/01/2023 • Meeting held with local government on 01/02/2023 • Meeting held with local government on 02/02/2023 • Additional and updated materials provided to LGIP Reviewer between 03/02/2023 and 09/03/2023 in response to meetings and information requests
Final report	• Draft report issued on 17/02/2023 • Revised report issued on 23/02/2023 • Final report issued on 09/03/2023

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

Name	Title	Date of discussion (s)	Scope of discussion
Brett Davey	Manager, City Design	06/01/2023 18/01/2023 25/01/2023 01/02/2023 02/02/2023	• Financial sustainability • Alignment between AMP, LTFF, CAPEX and LGIP • SOW functionality • Process for improving alignment
Tony Dileo	Manager, Infrastructure Strategy	06/01/2023 18/01/2023 25/01/2023 01/02/2023 02/02/2023	• Financial sustainability • Alignment between AMP, LTFF, CAPEX and LGIP • SOW functionality • Process for improving alignment
Richard de Vries	Senior Strategic Planner	11/01/2023 17/01/2023 18/01/2023 25/01/2023 01/02/2023 02/02/2023	• Financial sustainability • Alignment between AMP, LTFF, CAPEX and LGIP • SOW functionality • Process for improving alignment • LGIP checklist responses • Compliance with MGR • Planning assumptions and Ipswich Population Modeller outputs • Extrinsic materials • PFTI mapping • Clarification of renewal proportions
Beth Anderson	Principal Treasury Analyst	18/01/2023 25/01/2023 01/02/2023 02/02/2023	• Financial sustainability • Alignment between AMP, LTFF, CAPEX and LGIP • SOW functionality and financial inputs

Compliance check findings

Based on the information provided and available at the time of the compliance check, the proposed Ipswich City Council LGIP is compliant with the Minister's Guidelines and Rules and the relevant aspects of the *Planning Act 2016*. In particular, the proposed new LGIP:

- Is consistent with the LGIP template and will integrate appropriately within the forthcoming Ipswich Plan 2024;
- Has been prepared with appropriate consultation between Council and relevant State departments including relating to transport matters;
- Will assist in improving the overall alignment between infrastructure planning, delivery and financial and budgeting instruments including the Long Term Financial Forecast, Asset Management Plans, and Capital Expenditure process; and
- Is based on an updated set of planning assumptions (the Ipswich Population Modeller) that provide a comprehensive basis on which to forecast the extent and timing of additional demand on trunk infrastructure networks.

Key issues arising from the compliance review are discussed separately below.

Capacity of the Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA)

The Checklist requires that the PIA accommodate at least 10 years, but no more than 15 years, of growth. The PIA for the proposed new LGIP accommodates greater than 15 years of growth and so is technically non-compliant.

This is due to the PIA including most urban zoned land within the City. The settlement pattern for the City is intended to facilitate a change over time towards densification and greater uptake in attached dwelling product particularly in centres. The extent of this infill development is also envisaged under the urban consolidation targets identified within Shaping SEQ.

Based on the information provided in Schedule 3, total dwellings within the PIA at the end of the planning horizon (2046) is projected to be 140,287 dwellings, with 40,605 (approx. 29%) being attached dwellings. However, ultimate capacity for attached dwellings within the PIA is projected as being 78,110, which indicates the intent to consolidate growth over time within existing urban areas. Given such a large capacity for infill and consolidation within the PIA particularly for attached housing types, it is unclear how the PIA could be amended to only provide for 15 years of growth.

Reduction in the capacity of the PIA could only be achieved by removing future greenfield areas. However, this would potentially lead to potential issues with coordinating and funding of trunk infrastructure in the greenfield growth fronts which are still expected to experience significant growth, and some of which are already developing.

Further, the PIA is intended to assist with the sequencing and prioritising of the provision of trunk infrastructure. It is considered the proposed PIA meets this purpose, as most of the PIA and established urban areas are already serviced and will accommodate the majority of additional dwellings.

In this regard, the proposed PIA is considered appropriate and meets the intended function.

Departures in the alternative SOW model

The SOW model utilised for the proposed LGIP does not strictly use the template model, and instead uses an alternative bespoke model. The MGR provides for alternative SOW models to be used, however requires at Chapter 5, Part 6, Section 37 that when using an alternative SOW model it:

> *"…performs the same function and includes all the information contained in the standard SOW model available on the department's website. It must not make it harder to be reviewed by other parties and must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of this part and Schedule 7."*

The SOW model available on the department's website at the time of this review is an Excel spreadsheet titled 'Appendix C Schedule of Works Model, Version 11, dated February 2016'. In the worksheet where a local government identifies the summary cost schedule for each network, the standard SOW model only requires the calculation of the cost per demand unit for each service catchment.

The alternative SOW model in the proposed LGIP amendment extends this functionality and includes additional functions that allow for calculating an aggregated cost for each dwelling within the service catchment, as well as further information on the demand/cost at current value and at net present value, and to reflect the impact of the proportional split of charges revenue between Council and Urban Utilities. This also provides the ability to calculate a weighted average cost per dwelling of the provision of all LGIP networks which gives useful guidance to the balance between regulated charge revenue per dwelling and the actual cost of delivery per dwelling.

The changes to the SOW model are an addition to the basic functionality, and do not make it more difficult to review or understand the SOW outputs.

Finally, the SOW has been prepared by an external consultant that is also identified as an Appointed reviewer by the Department of State Development, Local Government Infrastructure and Planning. Whilst the consultant is not exercising its role as a reviewer in this instance, the experience and qualifications are relevant to the preparation of the SOW.

Alignment of planning assumptions with the QGSO projections

The Checklist requires that the population and dwelling assumptions be based on the data prepared by the Queensland Government Statisticians Office (QGSO) at the time of preparation, and refined to reflect development trends in the respective local government area.

At the time of the commencement of preparation of the proposed LGIP and the planning assumptions that underpin it, the latest QGSO projections were the 2018 series.

The Ipswich Population Modeller (IPM) project provides the basis for all planning assumptions in the LGIP. The IPM uses a range of data analysis (including QGSO, ABS and Council derived statistics) and assumptions to project future residential and non-residential (employment) populations across the Ipswich LGA. The IPM project has been able to compare earlier residential growth projections (i.e. forecasting based on assumptions) with actual growth rates in updated Estimated Residential Population (ERP) data from ABS. This analysis has identified that to reach the 2018 medium series QGSO projected population of 557, 649 persons at 2041 the compounding annual growth rate would need to be 4.31%. However actual development between 2001 and 2020 has averaged an approximate 3.3% compounding annual growth rate. Scenario analysis using this growth rate identifies a 2041 projected population of 453,857 persons. While this remains a large increase (approximately doubling the current population), it is approximately 100,000 persons less than current QGSO 2018 medium series projections.

On this basis for the purposes of the LGIP planning assumptions a residential growth rate of 3.3% per annum (compounding) has been used to better align with actual growth trend data (based on the average of the Census data from 2001 to 2016 and the ABS ERP value at 30 June 2020). This will improve alignment of infrastructure delivery with realistic growth rates and potential charges revenue.

It is noted that while the LGIP planning assumptions and projections are using a lower and more realistic level of growth, the ultimate development capacity of urban zoned land within the City is capable of accommodating the higher population estimates contained in QGSO and Shaping SEQ.

Financial Sustainability

The Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) requires that the trunk infrastructure in an LGIP can be funded by a combination of infrastructure charges and other revenue such as rates, grants, or subsidies.

As part of the preparation of the LGIP, a Financial Sustainability Review has been undertaken. In summary, the review forecasts a sustainability (cost recovery) ratio of approximately 60% of the cost of trunk infrastructure through the levying of infrastructure charges on development, meaning that approximately 40% of the cost of the LGIP must be gathered from other sources.

Council has advised that it is able to fund the full LGIP network costs from infrastructure charges and rates. However, it notes that this will be challenging to finance and balance Council's other investment and spending priorities.

The sustainability ratio from this exercise is sub-optimal, and substantially lower than the present LGIP (at approximately 88%), and is largely reflective of the current inflation of works and land costs for infrastructure projects which is in the order of 30%. Council acknowledges that there will be a significant sustainability challenge that will in part need to rely heavily on initiatives to improve financial sustainability as well as seeking funding sources outside of the collected infrastructure charges to accommodate future growth which may include:

- increases in infrastructure contributions revenue (the prescribed charge is periodically updated to reflect PPI which may not be adequate to fully fund trunk infrastructure);
- rates and grants;
- alternative funding sources for major infrastructure;
- construction cost efficiency targets;
- further network review and consolidation; and
- improved alignment between the LTFF, Capital Works Program and the LGIP.

Given the outcome of the proposed LGIP and the critical importance of long term sustainability, Ipswich City Council will continue to invest in the consideration of the funding sources., improvements and efficiencies as described above and is particularly interested in assisting the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning in its review of the adopted charges regime.

Conclusions

Based on the information provided and available at the time of the compliance check, the proposed Ipswich City Council LGIP is compliant with the Minister's Guidelines and Rules and the relevant aspects of the *Planning Act 2016*.

The key issues identified by the review do not interfere with the ability of the LGIP to forecast future trunk infrastructure requirements and costs, and in particular:

- The extent of the PIA provides excess capacity however does not conflict with the intended settlement pattern for the City, and the provision of trunk infrastructure within the PIA is aligned with the projected growth over the 15 year PIA horizon;
- The SOW model provides a clear framework for projecting infrastructure costs and charges revenue to inform the LTFF and capital works programs;
- The planning assumptions as projected from the Ipswich Population Modeller use an appropriate mix of QGSO data and local refinement to provide a realistic assessment of projected population, dwellings and employment growth over the LGIP horizon; and
- The cost of the LGIP can be carried by Council through a combination of infrastructure charges and other revenue sources, and the financial sustainability position can be improved over time in response to other organisational actions.

Recommendations

1. Morgan Wilson Planning Consultant recommends to the Ipswich City Council that the LGIP should proceed unchanged.
2. Morgan Wilson Planning Consultant further recommends that:
    i. Council continue to engage with the State and other relevant bodies to review and amend the regulated infrastructure charges to better reflect the actual cost of trunk infrastructure delivery.
    ii. Council continue to invest in the preparation of strategies to improve the efficiency of trunk infrastructure delivery;
    iii. Council continue with the ongoing review to improve the alignment between the LGIP and the AMP and LTFF;
    iv. Council continue to action the recommendations of the Asset Management Improvement Project; and
    v. Council continue to improve coordination and alignment between capital delivery and the LGIP.

Recommended conditions to be imposed

NIL

LGIP review checklist

Approved form MGR5.1 under the Planning Act 2016

Review principles:

- A reference in the checklist to the LGIP is taken to include a relevant reference to the *Planning Act 2016* and chapter 5 of the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.
- Terms in this checklist that are defined in the *Planning Act 2016* or the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.

The checklist must not be taken to cover all requirements of the *Planning Act 2016* and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules. Local governments must still have regard to the requirements as set out in the *Planning Act 2016* and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules when preparing or amending an LGIP.

Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) checklist				**To be completed by local government**		**To be completed by appointed reviewer**			
LGIP 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 for LGIPs and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules	**All**	1.	The LGIP sections are ordered in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	The LGIP has been prepared and is structured in accordance with the LGIP template.	YES	The Proposed LGIP has been prepared using the LGIP template and is ordered and structured consistent with the order and structure of the LGIP template.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		2.	The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme.	Yes	The LGIP is to be included as Part 6 of the Ipswich planning scheme rather than Part 4. The LGIP will also include content in the schedules consistent with the LGIP template. This placement improves the overall legibility of the scheme and provides a clear line of sight from the strategic framework to the local frameworks and zones. It is noted that specific placement is not a mandatory requirement.	YES	The proposed LGIP will form Part 6 of the Ipswich City Council Planning Scheme, with the associated mapping and tables being included in Schedule 3. The proposed LGIP and component parts have been numbered to reflect this.	NIL	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 mandatory parts of the LGIP template have been included. There are minor deviations from the text provided in the template, principally in relation to additional information regarding Desired Standards of Service for the Transport Network, however these changes reflect the local context and do not interfere with the intent or operation of the mandatory text.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		4.	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Yes	All references are correct.	YES	Internal references to maps and tables are correct.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions do not conflict with statutory requirements.	Yes	The additional definitions included are administrative only and do not conflict with the statutory definitions.	YES	Only administrative definitions principally from other statutory instruments have been included in Schedule 1 for ease of use and information purposes.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
	Preliminary section	6.	The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The preliminary section has been prepared consistent with the LGIP template.	YES	The preliminary section is drafted in accordance with the LGIP template.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		7.	All five trunk networks are included in the LGIP. (If not, which of the networks are excluded and why have they been excluded?)	No	The transport, parks and land for community facilities trunk networks have been included in the LGIP. The water and sewerage trunk networks have not been included as they are planned and	NO	The proposed LGIP includes three (3) trunk networks being: • Transport Network; • Parks Network; and • Land for Community Facilities Network.	NIL	LGIP may proceed

					administered by Urban Utilities (Water Distributor Retailer). Council's current LGIP does not include a stormwater trunk network. As necessary stormwater infrastructure is provided at the individual site level through the development process, a stormwater trunk infrastructure network has not been included in the LGIP. Future inclusion of a stormwater network remains under review.		Ipswich City Council does not plan or provide water and wastewater trunk services, which are planned and provided by Urban Utilities (UU) as the distributor/retailer for the LGA. Ipswich City Council does not provide a trunk stormwater network under the current LGIP, and is not proposing to include a trunk stormwater network at this time due to cost and technical constraints. Alternatively, Council relies on stormwater management to be provided on a site by site basis through development. This is a typical approach across many LGAs, and provides an appropriate standard of service to manage stormwater in the City in a cost effective manner. The combination of the proposed LGIP, the provision of stormwater through approvals, and the Netserv plan by UU make the trunk network complete, and provide the ability for the community or users to understand the full extent of the trunk infrastructure networks in the Ipswich LGA.		
	Planning assumptions - structure	8.	The drafting of the Planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The planning assumptions section has been prepared consistent with the LGIP template.	YES	The planning assumptions section is drafted in accordance with the LGIP template.	NIL	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, termed local frameworks (LAF) have been included in the relevant tables and on the relevant maps.	YES	The projection areas used for the planning assumptions are based on the Local Area Frameworks (LAF). There are 29 LAFs which are mapped on LGIP Map 1 and accord directly to the relevant projection areas in Table SC3.1.1 and Table SC3.1.2.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		10.	All the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) maps and vice versa.	Yes	The service catchments / LAF references have been included in the relevant tables and identified on the corresponding PFTI maps for each network.	YES	The service catchments for each network are based on the LAFs shown on LGIP Map 1. This approach provides a consistent basis across the LGIP for understanding demand and apportioning cost.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
	Planning assumptions - methodology	11.	The population and dwelling projections are based on those prepared by the Queensland Government Statistician (as available at the time of preparation) and refined to reflect development trends in the local government area.	Yes	The Queensland Government population projections, 2018 edition as produced by the Queensland Government Statistician Office (QGSO 2018) were used to calibrate the population and dwelling projections, the spatial allocation of growth, and were used to set the occupancy rates. The	YES	The population and dwelling projections for the LGIP have been calculated through the Ipswich Population Modeller (IPM), which is a GIS model that models future growth and propensity to develop for each lot across the City taking into account planned densities and land use preferences, observed	NIL	LGIP may proceed

					overall compounding growth rate was set at 3.3%, being better aligned with the QGSO 2018 low series and to better reflect historical and current rates of actual growth. Refer to the LGIP Extrinsic Material Report – Planning Assumptions, November 2022 for further details. Consultation with both the State (as coordinated by the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning) and Urban Utilities was undertaken in June through to September 2022 with in principle support provided. Although the LGIP projections do not directly align with the QGSO 2018 medium series, support for the LGIP planning assumptions and projections were provided, noting they reflect the balancing of the 'bottom up' and 'top down' approach as required by the MGR.		development trends, and development constraints. The IPM was calibrated using the latest available QGS data (2018 edition) at the time of the project, and QGS data regarding occupancy rates was also adopted. This was also tested against the ABS results released in 2020. A lower growth rate was adopted for the IPM based on analysis of historical and current growth rates to seek greater alignment with observed development trends. The population and dwelling assumptions derived from the IPM align broadly with the QGSO 2018 low series, reflect observed development rates over twenty years, and provide an appropriate, consistent and transparent basis on which to proceed with network planning.		
		12.	The employment and non-residential development projections align with the available economic development studies, other reports about employment or historical rates for the area.	Yes	The non-residential development projections were aligned with the recommended growth rates contained in the Ipswich Demographic and Employment Analysis and IPM Input Report July 2022 (Jacobs) and were also informed by development trends, the Ipswich Retail Strategy Update, June 2021 (SGS Economics) and the Ipswich Industrial Land and Employment Needs Analysis, March 2022 (CDM Smith). Refer to the LGIP Extrinsic Material Report – Planning Assumptions, November 2022 for further details.	YES	A number of background studies were undertaken to inform the preparation of the LGIP including: • Ipswich Demographic and Employment Analysis (July 2022); • IPM Input Report (July 2022); • Ipswich Retail Strategy Update (June 2021); • Ipswich Industrial Land and Employment Needs Analysis (March 2022). These reports provided the basis for assumptions about employment growth, centres hierarchy, floorspace demand, and retention and participation rates across the various LAFs. The reports provide a contemporary review and analysis of non-residential growth and development, and provide an appropriate basis on which to make projections about future employment and non-residential floorspace outcomes.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		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 new Ipswich planning scheme (Ipswich Plan 2024) when determining	YES	The developable area for the LGIP is shown on LGIP Map 2. The developable area was calculated by applying a series of	NIL	LGIP may proceed

					development yields and planned densities. This ensures that constraints and the development intent for land within the city are fully integrated in the determination of developable areas. IPM modelling incorporated development constraint rules for specific hard constraints, whilst all other development constraints have been reflected within the applied density yields of the respective zone. Refer to the LGIP Extrinsic Material Report – Planning Assumptions, November 2022 for further details.		‘development constraint rules’ within the IPM for land affected by hard development constraints such as flooding, steep slopes, land potentially affected by historical mining subsidence, and height restriction areas associated with the Amberley air base. The rules apply a proportionate estimate of maximum density for each lot based on the type and nature of the constraint to derive a realistic development potential and outcome for each site.		
		14.	The planned densities reflect realistic levels and types of development having regard to the planning scheme provisions and current development trends.	Yes	The modelling approach adopted for the LGIP represents an averaged realistic extent of development for the purposes of long-term trunk infrastructure planning. The planned density accepts that development or redevelopment may occur on lots at higher or lower densities than the planned density, however the overall density of new development in an area is assumed to average out at the planned density. These adopted planned densities are reflective of development constraints, developability and servicing levels.	YES	The LGIP is fundamentally based on the density assumptions for each zone as identified in the new ICC planning scheme. These planned densities are then tempered by applying a series of ‘development constraint rules’ within the IPM for land affected by hard development constraints such as flooding, steep slopes, land potentially affected by historical mining subsidence, and height restriction areas associated with the Amberley air base, as well as assumptions about the likely proportion of attached dwelling product that will realistically be taken up in higher density zones. The rules apply a proportionate estimate of maximum density for each lot based on the type and nature of the constraint and zone to derive a realistic development potential and density outcome for each site. It is noted that the LGIP was progressed in parallel with the planning scheme and the LGIP density and yield assumptions were based on the draft zoning at the time of preparation (31 November 2021). Due to ongoing refinements there have been minor adjustments in land use designation (zoning) and therefore potential development yield across some parts of the city. This is likely to be further adjusted following public notification and engagement. It is considered that this issue is not	The LGIP and the final Planning Scheme (as adopted) be reviewed to ensure that there is appropriate alignment between the demand assumptions. A future LGIP amendment may be required if there are significant departures and re-alignment is required.	LGIP may proceed

							material to the outcome of the current LGIP process and the planning assumptions are an appropriate basis on which to plan for long term infrastructure needs.		
		15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	The modelling approach appropriately accounts for the land requirements of local infrastructure by using averaged planned densities that are reflective of development constraints, developability and servicing levels.	YES	The planned densities in the LGIP are based on an average density for each zone based on an assessment of constraints, development potential, likely take-up, and historical trends in levels of growth. This average density takes into account the land needed for supporting infrastructure and reflects a realistic assessment of development potential for each lot or zone.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		16.	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the defined term.	Yes	The modelling approach adopted for the LGIP represents an averaged realistic or 'likely' extent of development at full development based on the Ipswich Plan 2024 zoning, consistent with the defined term.	YES	Ultimate development is defined in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules as: *'For a LGIP, for an area or premises, means the likely extent of development that is anticipated in the area, or on the premises, if the area or premises are fully developed.'* This is essentially the maximum capacity that can be accommodated across the projection areas of the City at build-out. The proposed LGIP is based on the outputs of the IPM which projects the maximum population and employment capacity for each lot based on planned density for each zone (based on the draft Ipswich Plan 2024 at the time of preparation), balanced with the impacts of constraints and realistic levels of take-up for attached housing product. This data is then aggregated up for each zone and projection area to derive 'ultimate development' capacity available under the proposed LGIP and the Ipswich Plan 2024.	NIL	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 (2021) both within the PIA and to ultimate, by projection area (being the local frameworks - LAF). The tables identify the capacity to accommodate growth to achieve the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (Shaping SEQ)	YES	The capacity of a given projection area can be calculated by comparing ultimate development to the projected population or employment outcome at each 5-year cohort of the LGIP. Based on review of the materials in Schedule 3 of the proposed LGIP,	NIL	LGIP may proceed

					population benchmarks (and beyond). The identified PIA is anticipated to exceed 15 years of projected growth capacity.		there is sufficient capacity in each projection area (LAF) to accommodate the projected demand at the LGIP horizon (2046).		
		18.	The determination of planning assumptions about the type, scale, timing and location of development, reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	Although the planning assumptions have been updated to reflect the Ipswich Plan 2024 zoning, the assumptions closely reflect the existing established settlement pattern and identified growth areas of the previous planning scheme with no substantial changes proposed to the previous extent of the Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA). This is reflected in the high percentage of development included in the PIA and Ripley Valley PDA and continues to represent a sequential pattern of growth. Refer to the LGIP Extrinsic Material Report – Planning Assumptions, November 2022 for further details.	YES	The pattern of development for Ipswich as expressed in the draft Ipswich Plan 2024 has been used as the basis for the planning assumptions, along with considerations of PDAs and greenfield areas operating under preliminary approvals and existing structure planning frameworks. This coordination between the LGIP and the draft planning framework provides an efficient and coordinated roll out of development and trunk infrastructure. It is acknowledged that the intended settlement pattern: • remains broadly consistent with the previous planning framework; • has been refined as necessary to reflect observed levels of growth and remaining capacity in the Ripley PDA and Springfield Structure Plan Area; and • the impacts of this on the timing and location of future growth fronts.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		19.	The relevant state agency for transport matters and the distributor-retailer responsible for providing water and wastewater services for the area (if applicable), has been consulted in the preparation of the LGIP (What was the outcome of the consultation?)	Yes	Consultation with both the State (as coordinated by the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning) and Urban Utilities was undertaken in June through to September 2022 with in principle support provided. Although the LGIP projections do not directly align with the QGSO 2018 medium series, support for the LGIP planning assumptions and projections were provided, noting they reflect the balancing of the 'bottom up' and 'top down' approach as required by the MGR.	YES	Preliminary meetings with the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DSDILGP) were held in June 2022 to discuss the approach taken in preparing the planning assumptions and potential implications for the LGIP. A comprehensive data package of the proposed LGIP was provided to DSDILGP for coordinated review across relevant State departments. Based on this review, DSDILGP provided in principle support with the approach taken. The review noted that the population projections are at the lower end of the QGSO population data, however acknowledged that due to the age of the available QGSP projections (2018 and based on 2016 census data), the assumptions used in preparing the proposed LGIP appropriately reflect the latest observed data. DSDILGP also noted that the LGIP be	NIL	LGIP may proceed

							reviewed once the latest QGSO population projections becomes available to ensure an appropriate alignment between the two documents. Preliminary meetings and consultation were held with Urban Utilities (UU) as the distributor-retailer for the Ipswich LGA in June and July 2022. UU were provided the same data package as DSDILGP, and on review noted that population projections reflected their observed levels of growth, and expressed support for the general settlement pattern and sequencing of development in terms of efficiency and achievability.		
	Planning assumptions - demand	20.	The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of population and employment growth.	Yes	The infrastructure demand projections were produced using the LGIP projections from the base year to ultimate. Infrastructure demand projections were calculated using the projected population and employment growth and standard demand conversion factors to determine future infrastructure demand.	YES	The demand projections for the proposed LGIP use the common assumptions from the IPM as the basic inputs for population and employment growth. These are then factored by each trunk network using standard population/demand conversion factors to derive projections of infrastructure demand.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		21.	The infrastructure units of demand align with those identified in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules, or where alternative demand units are used, their numerical relationship to the standard units of demand is identified and explained.	Yes	The infrastructure units of demand in the LGIP generally align with and are comparable with the MGR using industry accepted rates. Vehicles per day per hectare (vpd / ha) and average hectare per person specific to each park type have been used for the Transport network and the Parks and Land for community facilities networks respectively.	YES	The proposed Ipswich LGIP includes three (3) trunk networks (with water and sewer being provided by Urban Utilities under a Netserv Plan): • Transport network: • Public Parks; and • Land for community facilities. The three (3) networks are based on the units of demand for each network in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) being: • Transport Network – vehicle trips per day (VPD); and • Public parks and land for community facilities – population based. The proposed LGIP uses this basis and aggregates as follows: • Transport Network – VPD/Ha; and • Public parks and land for community facilities – averaged persons/Ha). This approach accords with the planned density for zones having a range of outcomes, and the use of	NIL	LGIP may proceed

							these aggregated demand units provides an appropriate basis to apply a consistent demand unit across larger aggregated spatial areas.		
		22.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	Yes	The demand generation rates for the relevant infrastructure networks have been developed using industry accepted rates. The adopted demand generation rates for the transport network align with industry standards, the latest travel surveys in South East Queensland (SEQ), and they were also calibrated based on observed traffic movements in the region. The Parks and Land for Community Facilities generation rates have been derived using the planned densities and assumed population per dwelling type based on the Ipswich Plan 2024.	YES	The demand generation rates for each network are based on industry standard generation rates, considered in conjunction with information on local demand (including travel surveys and observed traffic movements) where available and appropriate to determine an accurate understanding of demand for each network in the relevant spatial area.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		23.	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	Yes	The service catchments / LAF references have been included in the relevant tables and identified on the corresponding PFTI maps for each network.	YES	The service catchments for the three (3) networks are based on the Local Area Frameworks (LAFs) and area specified in the tables of projected infrastructure demand in Schedule 3 (Tables SC3.1-6 and SC3.1-7). The service catchments are appropriately identified and correctly cross-referenced on the PFTI maps for each network.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		24.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the urban areas, and enable urban development costs to be compared.	Yes	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the urban areas, and enable urban development costs to be compared. The service catchments also cover non-urban areas, however infrastructure demand is only attributable to ‘urban’ development consistent with the MGR.	YES	The service catchments predominantly cover the urban parts of the City, however also extend into non-urban areas where capacity of the service catchment must be considered to appropriately design the relevant network. The service catchments are based on the Local Area Framework (LAF) spatial extents, and are used consistently across all networks. This allows for the urban development costs for all networks to be accurately compared to understand the relative cost of delivery across the different areas of the City.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		25.	The asset management plan (AMP) and Long Term Financial Forecast (LTFF) align with the LGIP projections of growth and demand.	No	Processes are underway to achieve improved alignment between AMP, LTFF and the LGIP.	NO	As part of a broader effort to better coordinate asset management, long term financial forecasting, and capital works programs, Ipswich	Alignment of the critical strategic documents should continue with the progress of the AMP, LTFF, LGIP and the coordination of	LGIP may proceed

			(If not, what process is underway to achieve this?)		Specifically, Council is currently investing in this proposed LGIP which includes improved alignment of projected growth with observed rates of historical and current trends, a new Planning Scheme, and an Assets Management project. In addition, Council is acquiring and implementing a new Spatial System and has implemented an infrastructure charges calculation and recording tool. This will enable an improved dataset and capability to improve alignment. Finally, Council is currently in the budget phase for the 23/24 Financial year and by the time this LGIP is potentially adopted, the preparation will be underway for the 24/25 financial year. It is therefore possible that over the 24/25 and 25/26 financial years that further advancement of alignment is possible. With these tools, the new LGIP, and noting the comments by the Appointed reviewer, Council will also be seeking improved alignment with the capital works program (1 year, 3 year, 10 year) as well as the LTFF. Where possible, alignment of existing planned projects has been considered in the LGIP build.		City Council has commenced with a series of review projects and internal coordination efforts. The intent is to achieve alignment and coordination across the organisation, with asset management plans (AMPs), Long Term Financial Forecasts (LTTFs) and the LGIP being continuously monitored, reviewed and updated to reflect ongoing changes and maintain a more accurate assessment of the relative financial position of the organisation. The proposed LGIP has been built from a first principles assessment and calculation of growth and demand, and will form the basis for demand projections across the organisation. It is noted that an improvement project for the current asset management system has been commenced and significant amendments and improvements are underway that will assist in achieving alignment and coordination across trunk infrastructure delivery, maintenance, and financial forecasting. It is further noted that in building the Schedules of Works (SOW) for the draft LGIP, an exercise in reviewing individual trunk projects with the current capital works program was undertaken to assist in aligning projected trunk delivery with longer term financial forecasting.	this with annual and 3 year capital works programs. The LGIP provides a solid foundation for this alignment work to occur. 1. Continue to deliver the action plan and recommendations for the Asset Management Improvement Program. 2. On completion undertake audit and alignment exercise between amended AMP and LGIP. 3. Develop organisational strategy for alignment of trunk infrastructure planning, delivery, operation and funding systems	
	Priority infrastructure area (PIA)	26.	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The PIA section has been prepared consistent with the LGIP template.	YES	The PIA section has been drafted using the LGIP template with no changes or additions.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		27.	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	Yes	All references are correct.	YES	The references in the draft LGIP to the PIA map series in Schedule 3 are correct and internally consistent.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		28.	The PIA boundary shown on the PIA map is legible at a lot level and the planning scheme zoning is also shown on the map.	Yes	The PIA boundary is included on all relevant mapping and is legible at the lot level. The PIA mapping also displays the planning scheme zones.	YES	The PIA boundary is shown on ‘Map 3 Priority Infrastructure Area’ as a bright green dashed outline and is legible at a lot level. The planning scheme zoning is also included on the PIA maps to assist in legibility and understanding of the spatial extent.	NIL	LGIP may proceed

		29.	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 was prepared to include all existing land that has been developed for non-rural purposes and is serviced with all relevant trunk infrastructure networks at the base date (30 June 2021).	YES	The PIA was developed on the basis that all non-urban land that is serviced by all trunk infrastructure networks was included.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		30.	The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years.	No	The PIA includes only minor expansions and contractions compared to the current PIA, including limited changes to accommodation minor logical extensions into expansion areas (greenfield areas). Although the PIA area will accommodate more than 15 years of growth, this reflects that the PIA includes most of the existing urban areas of Ipswich. These areas are zoned for urban purposes and provide for significant levels of consolidation (infill development) over the life of the Ipswich Plan 2024 to ultimate. The projected growth in the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area has also been considered in setting the PIA. Refer to the LGIP Extrinsic Material Report – Planning Assumptions, November 2022 for further details.	NO	The PIA as currently identified provides ability to accommodate growth beyond 15 years. This is due to the PIA including existing urban areas where a relatively large proportion of future urban growth is expected to be infill development to achieve urban consolidation targets under Shaping SEQ. Further, the PIA is intended to assist with the sequencing and prioritising of the provision of trunk infrastructure. It is considered the proposed PIA meets this purpose, as most of the PIA is already serviced and has significant capacity for infill types of development. The exceedance of the PIA horizon is not considered to materially impact on the ability of the LGIP to deliver infrastructure to priority areas, with all trunk networks planning for delivery of new trunk infrastructure in relation to projected demand and not in relation to geographical distribution.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		31.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development based on the existing settlement pattern, existing urban areas, with limited extension into expansion areas. The existing urban areas typically provide opportunity for extensive growth through consolidation (infill) over the life of the Ipswich Plan 2024 to ultimate. The PIA has been set to 2031 with the network planning aligned to reflect the projected growth for that period.	YES	The PIA covers all urban zoned land in the City and has limited provision for expansion areas, focusing short term development (out to 10 years) within areas with capacity to accommodate higher density and consolidation. This is an efficient pattern of development and reflects the settlement pattern of the Ipswich Plan 2024.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		32.	If there is an area outside the PIA that the planning assumptions show is needed for urban growth in the next 10 to 15 years, why has the area been excluded from the PIA?	Yes	Not relevant.	YES	No area outside the PIA is projected to be required for urban growth within 10-15 years. (It is noted that significant levels of growth will be accommodated within the Ripley Valley PDA, and the extent of the PDA has been	NIL	LGIP may proceed

							identified to reflect this settlement pattern.)		
	Desired standards of service (DSS)	33.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The DSS section has been prepared consistent with the LGIP template.	YES	The DSS section is structured in line with the LGIP template, however it includes additional paragraphs differentiating between design standards and levels of service standards. The additional paragraphs do not interfere with the understanding or readability of the document, and are intended to provide greater clarity in terms of describing the design and operational standards required for the various networks.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		34.	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 network extrinsic material documents and associated Planning Scheme Policies.	YES	The DSS are provided for each network and include the functional, operational, and design parameters as required under the MGR. It is noted that the transport network includes additional information specifying the hierarchy of roads that are identified as being trunk infrastructure. While not technically required, the inclusion of this information removes doubt and does not interfere with the understanding of the key planning and design standards for the network.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		35.	The DSS reflects the key, high level industry standards, regulations and codes, and planning scheme policies about infrastructure.	Yes	Each network has been reviewed and the DSS updated to reflect current information. Refer to the relevant network extrinsic material documents and associated Planning Scheme Policies for additional detail.	YES	The DSS for each network are consistent with typical trunk infrastructure design standards and conform generally to industry standards and historical levels and standards of service in the Ipswich LGA.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		36.	There is alignment between the relevant levels of service stated in the local government's AMP and the LGIP. (If not, what process is underway to achieve this?)	No	Processes are underway to achieve improved alignment between the AMP and the LGIP. A review of the existing AMP has been completed and an upgrade project has commenced.	YES	The current Asset Management Plan (AMP) operates as an amalgam of previous policy and operational decisions, and has not remained integrated with infrastructure planning, funding, or delivery systems. In practice, the standards of service for each network are held within each network and the asset management system will call on this data on an as required basis. A major review project of the AMP has recently been undertaken (known as the Asset Management Improvement Program) by external consultants. The review identified a range of deficiencies in the current	Alignment of the critical strategic documents should continue with the progress of the AMP, LTFF, LGIP and the coordination of this with annual and 3 year capital works programs. The LGIP provides a solid foundation for this alignment work to occur. 1. Continue to deliver the action plan and recommendations for the Asset Management Improvement Program. 2. On completion undertake audit and alignment exercise between amended AMP and LGIP. 3. Develop organisational strategy for alignment of trunk	LGIP may proceed

							AMP, and has developed an action plan that sets out the steps required to sequentially improve the AMP and regain alignment and calibration with the other trunk infrastructure planning, operation, and delivery functions of the organisation. This will also require a broader alignment and coordination audit across the organisation. An overall strategy for this coordination effort has been discussed and planning for a coordinated response is underway. The LGIP will form an integral input into the new AMP, and will act as the initial point of truth for organisational design and service standards.	infrastructure planning, delivery, operation and funding systems	
	Plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) – structure and text	37.	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	The PFTI section has been prepared consistent with the LGIP template.	YES	The PFTI section has been drafted using the LGIP template with no changes or additions.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		38.	PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes	PFTI maps are identified for all nominated networks.	YES	PFTI maps have been prepared for all trunk networks.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		39.	PFTI schedule of works summary tables for future infrastructure are included for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes	The PFTI schedule of works summary tables for future infrastructure for all nominated networks are identified in the preliminary section of Part 6 and located in Schedule 3 of the Ipswich Plan 2024.	YES	Summary tables of the Schedule of Works for each trunk network are included in draft Schedule 3.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
	PFTI – Maps *[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]*	40.	The maps clearly differentiate between existing and future trunk infrastructure networks.	Yes	The PFTI maps clearly distinguish the existing trunk network elements from future trunk network elements.	YES	For all networks the existing and future trunk infrastructure network is identified. Typically, the proposed new infrastructure is shown in multiple colour schemes, with the existing network in a single colour to allow for easy differentiation between existing and future items.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		41.	The service catchments referenced in the schedule of works (SOW) model and infrastructure demand summary tables are shown clearly on the maps.	Yes	The service catchments / LAF references included in the SOW have been included on the corresponding PFTI maps for each network.	YES	The service catchments for the three (3) networks are based on the Local Area Frameworks (LAFs) and are clearly shown on the PFTI maps for each network.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		42.	Future trunk infrastructure components are identified (at summary project level) clearly on the maps including a legible map reference.	Yes	All future trunk items are identified on the corresponding PFTI maps for each network.	YES	All future trunk items in the SOW and summary tables are identified on the PFTI mapping for each network.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		43.	The infrastructure map reference is shown in the SOW model and summary schedule of works table in the LGIP.	Yes	Map references are provided in the schedule of works tables and the SOW model.	YES	The items and project ID numbers included in the SOW future works tables are consistent with the ID numbers in the summary schedule of works tables in Schedule 3.	NIL	LGIP may proceed

	Schedules of works *[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]*	44.	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP comply with the LGIP template.	Yes	The schedule of works tables have been prepared consistent with the LGIP template.	YES	The Schedules of Works tables in Schedule 3 are consistent with the format of the LGIP template.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		45.	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the *Planning Act 2016* and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the *Planning Act 2016* (the Act) and MGR.	YES	The Schedules of Works only include trunk infrastructure that meets the definition for 'development infrastructure' as provided in Schedule 2 of the *Planning Act 2016*.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		46.	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 based on the planning assumptions to meet the infrastructure demand projections for the full LGIP period to 2046, including consideration of ultimate development.	YES	The capacity of the identified trunk infrastructure for each network is based on meeting the projected demand at the DSS.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		47.	Future urban areas outside the PIA and the demand that will be generated at ultimate development for the relevant network catchments have been considered when determining the trunk infrastructure included in the SOW model.	Yes	Networks have been planned in consideration of ultimate development.	YES	While the LGIP has a horizon of 25 years, the networks have been planned in consideration of the nature and scale of the respective trunk network at ultimate development. This will assist in achieving an efficient use of infrastructure as new infrastructure is sequentially delivered or upgraded as required to meet incremental increase in demand at specific times.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		48.	There is alignment of the scope, estimated cost and planned timing of proposed trunk capital works contained in the SOW model and the relevant inputs of the AMP and LTFF. (If not, what process is underway to achieve this?)	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 the asset maintenance and refurbishment to support the LGIP growth levels. Processes are underway to achieve improved alignment between the AMP and the LGIP. A review of the existing AMP has been completed and an upgrade project has commenced.	YES	As part of the preparation of the SOW, detailed analysis and audit of the proposed SOW and the capital works program have been undertaken. While generally aligned, there are instances of individual projects where project costs and timing are divergent. It is our understating that the differences in cost, scope and timing are typically in response to budget limitations, delivery capacity constraints, and organisational priorities that conflict with projected delivery timeframes. Work remains ongoing to finalise an organisational strategy and set of procedures to ensure that the SOW, capital works program, AMP and LTFF are based on common data input and are continuously monitored and reviewed to maintain alignment to the greatest extent practicable.	Alignment of the critical strategic documents should continue with the progress of the AMP, LTFF, LGIP and the coordination of this with annual and 3 year capital works programs. The LGIP provides a solid foundation for this alignment work to occur. 1. Ongoing review of AMP improvement project 2. Review and publication of internal strategy and procedure for capital works program build 3. Continuous monitoring of demand thresholds in LGIP, capital works program, and AMP to maintain alignment	LGIP may proceed
		49.	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of work tables is consistent with legislative requirements.	Yes	The cost of trunk infrastructure identified in the SOW model and schedule of works tables is	YES	The costs used in the SOW model use a mix of unit rates, estimates and specific project costs which is	NIL	LGIP may proceed

					consistent with legislative requirements.		provided for under the MGR and the Act.		
	SOW model	50.	The submitted SOW model is consistent with the SOW model included in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	The SOW model is consistent with the model included in the MGR.	YES	The SOW model is based on the template provided as part of the Minister's Guidelines and Rules. However, additional functionality has been included to undertake additional costing calculations, and to reflect the impact of the proportional split of charges revenue between Council and Urban Utilities. The additional functionality does not reduce the or remove any of the functions in the template SOW model, or interfere with the ability to read or understand the SOW and as such is compliant with the MGR.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		51.	The SOW model has been prepared and populated consistent with the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	The SOW model has been prepared consistent with the LGIP template and has been populated consistent with the MGR.	YES	The data in the SOW model is based on the data requirements as set out in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		52.	Project owner's cost and contingency values in the SOW model do not exceed the ranges outlined in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules.	Yes	The project owner's cost and contingency values in the SOW model do not exceed the ranges outlined in the MGR.	YES	The project owner's costs and contingency allowances for each network are in accordance with the values identified in Schedule 7 of the Minister's Guidelines and Rules and have been applied consistently within the SOW model.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		53.	Infrastructure items included in the SOW model, SOW tables and the PFTI maps are consistent.	Yes	Each item in the SOW model is included in the schedule of works tables and PFTI maps consistently.	YES	The infrastructure projects are consistently numbered and identified across the SOW model, the SOW tables in Schedule 3, and the PFTI maps to enable cross referencing and identification of project costs and timing.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
	Extrinsic material	54.	All relevant material including background studies, reports and supporting information that informed the preparation of the proposed LGIP is available and identified in the list of extrinsic material.	Yes	The nominated extrinsic material, including all relevant background reports are identified and available.	YES	There is an extensive body of supporting work which has been prepared to support the proposed LGIP amendment. The extrinsic materials for each network are included with a summary report, and references to other supporting material is included within these reports as necessary.	NIL	LGIP may proceed
		55.	The extrinsic material explains the methodology and inter-relationships between the components and assumptions of the LGIP.	Yes	The extrinsic material explains the methodology and inter-relationships between the components and assumptions of the LGIP.	YES	The extrinsic material provides the general methodology undertaken to prepare the multiple components of the LGIP in relation to population and employment growth, projected demand, and network analysis and planning. The extrinsic reports are summary reports that synthesise a range of background studies undertaken into specific aspects. This is considered an appropriate approach given the	NIL	LGIP may proceed

							technical nature of these background reports. It is noted that if any additional technical reports if referenced in the extrinsic material can be made available to the public should they be requested.		