Appendix D – LGIP Checklist

Appendix D is part of Statutory Guideline 03/14 – Local government infrastructure plans

Review principles:

- A reference in the checklist to the LGIP Template is taken to include a relevant reference to the SPA, statutory guideline for LGIPs, statutory guideline for MALPI or the Queensland Planning Provisions (QPP).
- Compliance requirements are not limited to the requirements listed in the checklist.

Local government infrastructure plan (LGIP) checklist				To be completed by local government		To be completed by appointed reviewer			
LGIP guideline outcome	**LGIP component**	**Number**	**Requirement**	**Requirement met (yes/no)**	**Local government comments**	**Compliant (yes/no)**	**Justification**	**Corrective action description**	**Recommendation**
The LGIP is consistent with the legislation and statutory guideline for LGIPs	**All**	1.	The LGIP sections are ordered in accordance with the LGIP template.	Yes	States LGIP Template document has been used as the basis of Livingstone's LGIP with only minor amendments	Yes	The draft LGIP is ordered in a manner that is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		2.	The LGIP sections are correctly located in the planning scheme.	Yes	LGIP numbering has been updated to align with the Planning Scheme	Yes	The draft LGIP will be located in section 4 of the planning scheme which is consistent with the format of the now superseded Queensland Planning Provisions.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		3.	The content and text complies with the mandatory components of the LGIP template.	Yes	States LGIP Template document has been used as the basis of Livingstone's LGIP with only minor amendments	Yes	The content complies with the mandatory elements, with only minor variations that do not interfere with the understanding or operation of the document.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		4.	Text references to numbered paragraphs, tables and maps are correct.	Yes	States LGIP Template document has been used as the basis of Livingstone's LGIP with only minor amendments	Yes	The content uses internally consistent references to tables, maps and figures. In response to Ministerial conditions, a minor typographical error has been updated at Section 4.5.2 to create a continuous numbering of paragraphs in accordance with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Definitions	5.	Additional definitions (to those in the QPP) do not conflict with statutory requirements.	Yes	Some additional definitions have been included but do not conflict with QPP or those contained in the current Planning Scheme	Yes	Additional administrative definitions have been included that assist in the interpretation of the LGIP, and do not conflict with other definitions.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Preliminary section	6.	The drafting of the Preliminary section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	States LGIP Template document has been used as the basis of Livingstone's LGIP with only minor amendments	Yes	The draft preliminary section (Section 4.1) is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

							In response to Ministerial conditions, LGIP development types have been updated in Table 4.1 to align with the LGIP template.		
		7.	All five trunk networks included in the LGIP. If not, which networks are excluded? Why have these networks been excluded?	Yes		Yes	The draft LGIP includes all five networks including: • Water supply; • Sewerage; • Stormwater; • Transport; and • Parks and community facilities.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Planning assumptions - structure	8.	The drafting of the Planning assumptions section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	States LGIP Template document has been used as the basis of LSCs LGIP	Yes	The draft LGIP is consistent with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		9.	All the projection areas listed in the tables of projections are shown on the relevant maps and vice versa.	Yes	Projection areas identified in Tables SC 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 have been be amended to facilitate a more comprehensive guidance on the scope of areas covered by the PIA as follows: • Inside PIA – Emu Park and Zilzie • Inside PIA - Kinka Beach • Inside PIA – Yeppoon (including Cooee Bay, Taranganba, Lammermoor, Rosslyn, Pacific Heights, Mulambin, hidden Valley, taroomball and inverness) The cadastre for these localities can be identified on the existing PIA maps. Projections have been developed as follows: • SA2 data (May 2017) has been used to provide the “baseline” for projected population growth 2011-2036; • The most recent (2011) ABS Community Profiles have been used to determine; • The State’s employment containment rates have been applied to determine labour force containment and job containment within the region; • We’ve then used the States Excel model to provide an initial estimate of residential	Yes	The projection areas for Tables 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 are aggregated into four overarching units, made up of the 65 smaller projection/catchment areas identified on ‘localities’. Notes within Column 1 ‘Projection Area’ refer to the catchments included within the projection areas. In response to Ministerial conditions, LGIP development types have been updated in Tables 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 to align with the LGIP template.		LGIP may proceed.

					and non-res projections which align closely with the above (specifically SA2 projections); • This then provides Council with projections from the 2011 census data up to 2026. • Projections beyond 2026 have been derived assuming 2021-26 SA2 growth rates apply for the periods 2026-2031 and 2031-2036. This produced an estimated population in 2036 of 57,052 which compares well with the SA2 projection of 57,042. • The same growth projections have been used to estimate non-res growth (employment and GFA) based on the assumption that growth in non-res land uses will follow growth in residential population. • This process yields a 2036 dwelling count that is marginally higher than previous estimates of the dwelling count (SOW previously suggested an ultimate in the order of 24,886 while the implied SA2 growth between 2031-2036 suggests an estimated dwelling count of 28,119 in 2036. As this is in excess of the previously estimated "ultimate", we've labelled the 2036 projections as "ultimate" projections.				
		10.	All the service catchments listed in the tables of projected infrastructure demand are identified on the relevant PFTI maps and vice versa.	Yes	Mapping has been provided separately. Table 3.1.7 clearly aligns the thirty (30) service catchments with the sixty-five (65) localities identified in Table 4.19 Separate PIFTIS have been developed for each of the sixty-five (65) localities	Yes	The service catchments in Table 3.1.7 are aggregated into 30 cost catchments, with a note clearly identifying which localities are included within which service catchment.		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	<u>Population and dwelling projections</u> The source of the baseline data (2011 -2036) data for the LGIP	Yes	The population projections in Table 4.2 are consistent with the QGSO population projections (Projected	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

					comes from the SA2 data provided by QGSO around May 2017. This data provided initial estimates of both population overall as well as broad distribution of population across the Livingstone region as well as an estimate of dwelling structure (i.e. percentage of the population living in single dwellings, multiple dwellings or other accommodation). The overall population and dwelling forecast were also checked against Councils internal detailed pop modelling. The third and final refence point was the States PIPICS model which also provided a comparative estimate of residential (and non-residential) projections which broadly aligned with the more recent SA2 / Council pop modelling data. Collectively this data provided a sound forecast for population and dwellings. The challenge was then to determine the "split" of pop/dwellings within the PIA and outside the PIA. This was done with refence to Councils Population Allocation Model as well as the proportional allocation of population and dwellings inside/outside the PIA implied in the States model. Once he likely pop/dwellings within the PIA were identified, the figures for "outside" the PIA become a balancing item to ensure that the totals align with the QGSO estimates. This provided a sound "first principles" baseline of data out to at least 2026. Population and dwelling projections for 2031 were derived using a broader process "anchored" to the total pop figures for the region. Anticipated growth for the region (2026-2031) was identified and applied to the estimates for each individual		population medium series by local government area, Queensland, 2011 to 2036; 2015). The dwelling projections in Table 4.3 are slightly higher than the QGSO figures, however the projections are based on a reasonable and comprehensive methodology and are considered to appropriately reflect available data and local development intensity. In response to Ministerial conditions, an additional 'Assumptions Report' has been provided. This report clearly sets out the information used to inform the assumptions, and the process and calculations used in developing and testing the assumptions.		

					area to provide a 2031 pop estimate. Through this process, the population growth rates implied in the tables are consistent with the QGSO figures, Livingstone's detailed Population Modelling and the states PIPICS model outcomes. Dwelling structure was initially derived using dwelling densities suggested in the States PIPICS model for Livingstone (2011). This suggested an average density of 2.12 people/dwelling in 2011 falling to 2.03 at ultimate development. The 2011 estimate is broadly consistent with the ABS data contained in its Basic Community Profile which suggests a higher 2011 density of 2.45/dwelling. However, as the BCP is dated 2011 it also includes Rockhampton as well as Livingstone. The states estimates were adopted as being more applicable to Livingstone as a "stand alone" entity. Estimates of the "ultimate" capacity of projection areas have been generated using Councils **Planning Assumption Model** (Version 2). This GIS based model contains the urban boundary for Livingstone Shire and applies planning densities at a lot level to ascertain a potential "ultimate" development capability. In some instances, the ultimate capacity may be tempered by additional assumptions (e.g. the likelihood of achieving 100% build out).				
		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	**<u>Existing and Projected Employment (Employees)</u>** The initial (2011) estimates of the employed population have been based on data contained	Yes	The employment projections are generally consistent with the QGSO employment projections, and are based on reasonable assumptions	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

					within the ABS Basic Community Profile. This statistical profile provides a detailed outline of the total number of employed people within an area. By dividing the total number of employed people with total residential population, a baseline employment rate was determined at around 34.7%. Application of these employment rates to the population within the relevant areas provided an initial estimate of the total employment. However, more recent figures suggested that the current rate of employment generation was closer to 32% of population. Historical statistical data provided a split of employment distribution for each area across a range of industries. This crudely identified the employment profile for the Livingstone area as follows: • Commercial 40% • Retail 12% • Industrial 15% • Community 11% • Other# 22% Together this provided an estimate of total employment as well as a distribution of employment by industry. Regional allocation of employment implied in the States RICSICS Model was initially used to allocate jobs to each of the three PIA areas. This approach ensures that the employment projections are tied to population. The underlying assumption is that that there are no material changes in the mix of industries between areas over time. **<u>Existing and Projected Non-residential Floor Space</u>** Employment figures were used to generate a “baseline”		and local understanding. In response to Ministerial conditions, an additional ‘Assumptions Report’ has been provided. This report clearly sets out the information used to inform the assumptions, and the process and calculations used in developing and testing the assumptions.		

					estimate of Non-residential floor area using the conversion rates previously provided by the State. The outcomes of this initial assessment were compared with current estimates of non-residential GFA and were accepted as a reasonable estimate going forward. Maintaining the “one to one” relationship between employment and GFA creates a strong alignment of non-residential growth and employment growth. While this can overlook changes in industry mix and industry structure over time, these figures were considered the “best available” at this point in time.				
		13.	The developable area excludes all areas affected by absolute constraints such as steep slopes, conservation and flooding.	Yes	The Developable Area has been derived as the area of land that is not subject to a development constraint including: • Acid sulphate soils • Airport environs • Biodiversity • Bushfire hazard • Coastal hazard • Extractive resources and minerals • Flood hazard • Hazardous activities • Heritage • Regional infrastructure • Scenic amenity • Steep land • Water resource catchment The developable area for the region was determined through the process of development of the Planning Scheme.	Yes	The developable area for the LGA takes into account constraints to development as mapped as overlays to the planning scheme. As part of the Planning Assumptions Model (PAM) prepared in 2009, a detailed GIS model at a lot level was created to provide an accurate bottom up model for the locality. This model allowed for a proportionate allocation of the development potential for each lot in the local government area – where a lot was partially subject to a constraint the potential impact of that constraint on the individual lot could be considered and a proportion of the site (i.e. 20%, 50% etc) allocated as developable depending on the circumstances.	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	Yes	The planned densities align with the new planning scheme zones and known (existing) and planned landuse densities.	Yes	The planned densities are generally in accordance with planning scheme zone expectations where	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

			trends.				specified within zone codes, and are consistent with similar regional local governments.		
		15.	The planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	Planned densities account for land required for local roads and other infrastructure.	Yes	The LGIP authors have confirmed that the planned densities take into account that a proportion of developable area will be required to accommodate infrastructure, however have not provided detail regarding what proportion has been used in calculations.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		16.	The population and employment projection tables identify "ultimate development" in accordance with the QPP definition.	Yes	We have amended the projections to include an estimate of "ultimate" development. This provides the means to determine remaining capacity to accommodate growth across the region Estimates of the "ultimate" capacity of projection areas has been generated using Councils **Planning Assumption Model** (Version 2). This GIS based model contains the urban boundary for Livingstone Shire and applies planning densities at a lot level to ascertain a potential "ultimate" development capability. In some instances, the ultimate capacity may be tempered by additional assumptions (e.g. the likelihood of achieving 100% build out). The PIA area was specifically developed using information from the **Planning Assumptions Model** to ensure that the PIA contains the requisite 10-15 years growth. The PIA reflects the population and employment projections contained within the LGIP.	Yes	The 'ultimate development' included in the population and employment projection tables is based on the capacity of each projection area to accommodate development.	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		Yes	The 'ultimate development' included in the population and employment projection tables is based on the capacity of each projection area to accommodate development.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		18.	The planning assumptions reflect an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	Planning assumptions have been aligned with demand, current market conditions and known intent as advised by the development community.	Yes	The planning assumptions are generally aligned with the planning scheme intent in terms of timing, location, and type of development.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

		19.	Has the Department of Transport and main Roads or any relevant distributor-retailer been consulted in the preparation of the LGIP? What was the outcome of the consultation?	Yes	The LGIP has been discussed previously with DTMR (note minutes of meeting of 9 March 2016 and email correspondence of July 14 and 16 2016), as part of the discussion of Councils Adopted Infrastructure Charges Resolution (AICR). Advice to Council is that DTMR have no objection to the structure/content of the LGIP correspondence of June 2016 (refer item 9)	Yes	Consultation with DTMR has been undertaken, and no amendments or conditions were required.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Planning assumptions - demand	20.	The infrastructure demand projections are based on the projections of population and employment growth.	Yes	Council has developed a detailed Planning Assumptions Model (PAM) which has been used to derive the current and projected population across the Shire. Additional refinement of the PAM was undertaken as part of the process of development of the LGIP to ensure that population and infrastructure assumption were aligned Indicative range has been provided. However, given the spectrum of development which falls under the generic zone categories, Council reserves the right to determine transport demand on a "first principles" basis as required.	Yes	The demand projections in Table SC3.1.7 are based on the projections of employment and population growth. In response to Ministerial conditions, an additional 'Assumptions Report' has been provided. This report clearly sets out the information used to inform the assumptions, and the process and calculations used in developing and testing the assumptions.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		21.	The demand generation rates align with accepted rates and/or historical data.	Yes		Yes	The demand generation rates are based on current development demands within the LGA, and on review are generally consistent with demand in other similar LGA's. In response to Ministerial conditions, an additional 'Assumptions Report' has been provided. This report clearly sets out the information used to inform the assumptions, and the process and calculations used in developing and testing the assumptions.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		22.	The service catchments used for infrastructure demand projections are identified on relevant PFTI maps and demand tables.	Yes	PFTI maps are attached.	Yes	The service catchments in Table 3.1.7 are aggregated into 30 cost catchments, with a note clearly identifying which localities are included within which	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

							service catchment. Each of the 65 localities has a separate set of PFTI maps which provide a clear line of sight between service catchments and PFTI mapping.		
		23.	The service catchments for each network cover, at a minimum, the PIA.	Yes		Yes			
		24.	The Asset Management Plan and Long Term Financial Forecast align with the LGIP projections of growth and demand. If not, is there a process underway to achieve this?	Yes	The LGIP and LTFF are aligned. The Council has a process in place to align the LTAMPs with the needs of the LGIP	Yes	The LGIP and current LTFF are aligned, and the authors have advised that Council has a process in place to align the LTAMP with the LGIP.	*Council to continue with the process of aligning the LTAMPs for the shire with the LGIP.*	LGIP may proceed.
	Priority infrastructure area (PIA)	25.	The drafting of the PIA section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes	The draft LGIP is drafted in accordance with the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		26.	Text references to PIA map(s) are correct.	Yes	Map references contained in Tables 2.19 and 2.20 of the LGIP align with current PFTI mapping	Yes	The map references for the PIA mapping are correct and included in section 4.3(2).	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	PIA boundary clearly defined in the mapping set	Yes	The PIA is shown on a separate series of maps and is at a scale and resolution that allows identification at the lot level. The planning scheme zoning is not included on the PIA maps, however the inclusion is not considered to be necessary to the functioning of the LGIP	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	PIA accommodates demand, current market conditions and known intent as advised by the development community.	Yes	The PIA includes all areas currently serviced by trunk infrastructure.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		29.	The PIA accommodates growth for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years.			Yes	The PIA includes sufficient greenfield and infill development capacity to accommodate projected growth over a 15-year horizon.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		30.	Are there areas outside the PIA for which the planning assumptions identify urban growth within the next 10 to15 years? If so, why have these areas been excluded from the PIA?	No	The PIA area was developed using information from the **Planning Assumptions Model** to accommodate the requisite 10-15 years growth. As the Planning Scheme provides for urban expansion beyond the 10-15-year PIA horizon, some areas that have an urban zoning fall outside the PIA. The alignment of the PIA	Yes	A review of zone mapping for the planning scheme identifies parcels of land outside the PIA that are zoned for Low density residential within both the Yeppoon and Emu Park projection areas. It is noted that these areas are long term growth areas and are not planned to	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

					was developed using best available information including development intention and probability.		accommodate growth within the planning horizon of the LGIP.		
		31.	The PIA achieves an efficient, sequential pattern of development.	Yes	PIA was developed to reflect a least cost pattern of development. It accommodates demand, current market conditions and known intent as advised by the development community. One of the key outcomes from the recent Planning Assumptions Modelling (PAM) has been to determine a lest cost PIA	Yes	The PIA has been designed as a least cost provisioning model and generally aligns with the settlement pattern as set out in the planning scheme.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Desired standards of service (DSS)	32.	The drafting of the DSS section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes		Yes	The drafting 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		Yes	Criteria are provided for all trunk networks.	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		Yes	The design criteria are consistent with current criteria and provide a reasonable level of service for the community that aligns with expectations and statutory requirements.	N/A	
		35.	There is alignment between the relevant levels of service stated in the local government's Long-Term Asset Management Plan (LTAMP) and the LGIP. If not, is there a process underway to achieve this?	*	In general, the two align. However, there are fundamental differences between the concept of a DSS as stated in the LGIP (which covers trunk infrastructure only and focusses solely on growth) while the service standards contained in the LTAMPs covers standards for provision of non-trunk infrastructure as well as service outcomes across existing networks.	Yes	The LGIP authors note that the DSS for trunk infrastructure are consistent between the LGIP and the LTAMPs, however there are differences in relation to criteria for non-trunk works.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Plans for trunk infrastructure (PFTI) – structure and text	36.	The drafting of the PFTI section is consistent with the LGIP template.	Yes	PFTIs are detailed, show boundaries and planned trunk infrastructure at lot level as required under the template.	Yes	The draft LGIP consolidates all mandatory statements into a single section, however remains consistent with the LGIP template content.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		37.	PFTI maps are identified for all networks listed in the Preliminary section.	Yes		Yes	The draft LGIP includes a series of 65 locality maps that identify all PFTI for the LGA.	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		Yes	Summary tables for all infrastructure networks are provided in Schedule 3.2 of the draft LGIP.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.

	PFTI – Maps *[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]*	39.	The maps clearly identify the existing and future trunk infrastructure networks distinct from each other.	Yes	The PFTIS clearly identify all Councils intention to provide trunk infrastructure to support development within the nominated Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA)	Yes	The PFTI maps show both existing and planned infrastructure networks in a consistent and readable format.	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	As per item 10.	Yes	The service catchments are aggregated into 30 cost catchments, with a note in Table SC3.1.7 clearly identifying which mapped localities are included within which each service catchment.	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	The PFTIS clearly identify all Councils intention to provide trunk infrastructure to support development within the nominated Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA) In some instances, items of proposed trunk infrastructure may appear on more than one map (especially when these items are located at the edges of one catchmenet and, as a result, may also appear on the periphery of another catchment)	Yes	The PFTI maps include an alpha-numerical reference that links to the summary SOW tables in Schedule 3.2.	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		Yes	The PFTI maps include an alpha-numerical reference that links to the summary SOW tables in Schedule 3.2.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
	Schedules of works *[Add rows to the checklist to address these items for each of the networks]*	43.	The schedule of works tables in the LGIP complies with the LGIP template.	Yes	The current Schedule of Works Model has been used in the development of the LGIP	Yes	The draft SOW summary tables are consistent with the format in the LGIP template.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		44.	The identified trunk infrastructure is consistent with the SPA and LGIP guideline.	Yes		Yes	Only infrastructure that has a genuine trunk function is included in the SOW. It is noted that some items of infrastructure included in the Desired Standards of Service (DSS) are not trunk infrastructure as defined under the SPA. While these items are included in the DSS for clarity, they are not included in calculations of the cost of provision in the Schedule of Works model.	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 need for proposed trunk infrastructure has been studied in detailed planning reports which support the LGIP	Yes	The identified trunk infrastructure is aligned with the settlement pattern of the planning scheme and has been informed by studies undertaken to detail the type and extent of infrastructure required to service projected growth. These studies are identified in the extrinsic material.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.
		46.	Is there alignment of the scope, estimated cost and planned timing of proposed trunk capital works contained within the Schedule of Works and the relevant inputs of the LTAMP and LTFF? If not, is there a process underway to achieve this?	Yes	The LGIP and LTFF are clearly aligned. The Council has a process in place to align the LGIP and the LTAMP	Yes	The LGIP and current LTFF are aligned, and the authors have advised that Council has a process in place to align the LTAMP with the LGIP.	*Council to continue with the process of aligning the LTAMPs for the shire with the LGIP.*	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 SOW model includes a cost breakdown (including contingency and on costs)	Yes	The costs used in the SOW model are consistent with legislative requirements, and are based on the value of the current infrastructure and locally derived costs for future works and acquisitions. It is noted that some items of infrastructure included in the Desired Standards of Service are not trunk infrastructure as defined under the SPA. While these items are included in the DSS, they are not included in calculations of the cost of provision in the Schedule of Works tables and modelling.	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	The current Schedule of Works Model has been used in the development of the LGIP	Yes	The draft SOW is based on the template SOW provided with the statutory guideline.	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	Inputs to the SOW are based on the SOW user manual and take into account local context and understanding where relevant.	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	A detailed list of extrinsic material is available in Table 2.21	Yes	A list of extrinsic material relied up in the preparation of the draft LGIP is provided in Table 4.21 of the proposed LGIP document.	N/A	LGIP may proceed.