



PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

8 JULY 2014

Your attendance is required at a meeting of the Planning & Development Committee to be held in the Council Chambers, 232 Bolsover Street, Rockhampton on 8 July 2014 commencing at 1.30pm for transaction of the enclosed business.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the initials "C R" followed by a long horizontal stroke.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
1 July 2014

Next Meeting Date: 29.07.14

Please note:

In accordance with the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, please be advised that all discussion held during the meeting is recorded for the purpose of verifying the minutes. This will include any discussion involving a Councillor, staff member or a member of the public.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	OPENING.....	1
2	PRESENT	1
3	APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE	1
4	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	1
5	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS ON THE AGENDA.....	1
6	BUSINESS OUTSTANDING	2
	NIL	2
7	PUBLIC FORUMS/DEPUTATIONS	3
	NIL	3
8	OFFICERS' REPORTS.....	4
	NIL	4
9	STRATEGIC REPORTS	5
	9.1 QUEENSLAND'S INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND CHARGING FRAMEWORK CHANGES BRIEFING.....	5
10	NOTICES OF MOTION.....	20
	NIL	20
11	URGENT BUSINESS/QUESTIONS	21
12	CLOSED SESSION	22
	13.1 OUTSTANDING INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS AND INFRASTRUCTURE CHARGES	22
13	CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS.....	23
	13.1 OUTSTANDING INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS AND INFRASTRUCTURE CHARGES	23
14	CLOSURE OF MEETING	24

1 OPENING

2 PRESENT

Members Present:

The Mayor, Councillor M F Strelow (Chairperson)
Councillor C E Smith
Councillor S J Schwarten
Councillor R A Swadling
Councillor N K Fisher

In Attendance:

Mr E Pardon – Chief Executive Officer

3 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Leave of Absence for the meeting was previously granted to Councillor Cherie Rutherford

Leave of Absence for the meeting was previously granted to Councillor Tony Williams

Leave of Absence for the meeting was previously granted to Councillor Greg Belz

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee held 24 June 2014

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS ON THE AGENDA

6 BUSINESS OUTSTANDING

Nil

7 PUBLIC FORUMS/DEPUTATIONS

Nil

8 OFFICERS' REPORTS

Nil

9 STRATEGIC REPORTS

9.1 QUEENSLAND'S INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND CHARGING FRAMEWORK CHANGES BRIEFING

File No: RRPS-PRO-2010/01/01/05

Attachments:

1. Infrastructure Planning and Charging Changes explained
2. Fair Value Infrastructure Charges Schedule

Authorising Officer: Russell Claus - Manager Planning
Robert Holmes - General Manager Regional Services

Author: Robert Truscott - Coordinator Strategic Planning

SUMMARY

The State Government commenced a further review of infrastructure planning and charging arrangements in 2013. Following the release of a discussion paper and consultation late in 2013, a new regulatory framework commenced on 4 July 2014. This report provides a briefing on the changes and implications for Council as a result.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report on Queensland's Infrastructure Planning and Charging Framework Changes Briefing be received.

BACKGROUND

The infrastructure charging framework in place prior to 4 July 2014 had been in place since 1 July 2011. As reported to Council on 23 July last year the State Government commenced a review of those arrangements early in 2013. The review focussed on providing more transparent and certain processes for calculating infrastructure charges, better dispute resolution and a review of the maximum charge rates.

A review by 1 July 2014 had been a commitment of the previous State government at the commencement of the maximum charges framework in 2011. The review has also been prompted by strong representation from the development industry about the validity of charges, the impact on housing affordability and an unreasonable approach by some council's when considering the cost of delivering necessary trunk infrastructure.

The resultant changes commenced from 4 July 2014. A Sustainable Planning (Infrastructure Charges) Amendment Bill 2014, an associated State Planning Regulatory Provision and a new "Statutory guideline xx/14, Local government infrastructure plans" provide a head of power for the changes. The State has also introduced an option for councils to adopt new Fair Value (discounted) charges in return for State co-investment in Priority Development Infrastructure (PDI).

The time provided for consultation with stakeholders did not allow councils the opportunity to consult effectively on the final legislative instruments. The Parliamentary Committee in responding to submissions on the new bill specifically commented to this effect. None the less the changes were well canvassed during the Discussion Paper consultation and subsequent report to Council in July last year. The Fair Value charges option is the one exception to this.

To assist Councillors, a more detailed explanation of some of the more important mechanisms and changes is attached for reference.

COMMENTARY**Fair Value Charges:**

In association with the new arrangements the State has introduced a new “Fair Value” charges schedule that it believes more correctly reflects the average cost of delivering necessary trunk infrastructure across a much broader range of development categories. In general, the charges reflect a 10% reduction in residential maximum charges and a 15% reduction in non-residential maximum charges. The proposed schedule is attached. The greater range of categories recognises that the range of uses possible within some of the existing categories can place significantly different demands on infrastructure networks. Within the Low Impact Industry category, charging for storage sheds is a typical example that has caused difficulty in the past.

Council may choose to adopt this new schedule or retain the existing maximum charges unchanged. In the event councils opt for the Fair Value charges the State has committed to consider co-investing in some priority development infrastructure that is critical to economic development. The co-investment is not a grant or loan scheme and it is envisaged that State contributions may be recovered from sales once the development goes to market. The scheme will be operated by Economic Development Queensland. It will operate independently from Royalties for Regions. The scope and eligibility criteria have not been determined. Budget papers include an allocation of \$500M for this purpose; however, it is subject to future asset sales. The allocation and timing of distribution has not been announced and plans for asset sales must survive a public test at the next election.

As a further incentive the Fair Value charges will be indexed automatically based on a suitable construction index. If councils retain the current maximum charges the maximum charge rates can only be indexed by the Minister at their sole discretion. This may become important for managing the impacts of mandated offsets and refunds as will be discussed later.

Currently Council’s AICR No.3 sets residential charges at approximately 75% of the maximum charge (\$21,000 for a 3 B/R dwelling). Non-residential charges are set at the maximum charge. Therefore, adoption of the Fair Value charges would in fact allow Council to increase a 3 bedroom dwelling charge from the current \$21,000 to \$25,200. On the other hand, it would reduce all non-residential charges by 15%. The decision to “opt in” to Fair Value charges should also consider the short to medium term impact of the Incentives Policy. As it currently stands, there is no known regulatory imperative to “opt in” early. A further report analysing and recommending a course of action for Council on this matter will be provided once all the details of the scheme are available.

Sustainable Planning (Infrastructure Charges) Amendment Bill:

The main effects of these amendments on Council are limited to several areas;

- Infrastructure Charge offsets and refunds are now mandated and must be considered in calculating an Infrastructure Charges Notice (ICN). An offset is created when councils condition an applicant to carry out trunk infrastructure works as part of their approval. Council must now offset the establishment cost of these works against the full value of the charge, not just the relevant network impacted by the new demand. If the establishment cost of the conditioned works exceeds the calculated charge the ICN is cancelled and a refund must be paid by Council. The amount and timing of the refund payment by Council must now also be notified in the ICN. The timing can be appealed by the proponent.
- If an applicant does not agree with the establishment cost for the conditioned works, they may request it be recalculated up to the date the payment is due. A new statutory valuation methodology must be included in Councils Adopted Infrastructure Charges Resolution (AICR). Ultimately, the valuation will be determined by an independent certified quantity surveyor for works or registered property valuer for land. The valuation process is not open to appeal. It is not clear who pays for the valuation. Currently, Council in most cases only allow an offset equivalent to the valuation of the works in the

AICR. This is to acknowledge the fact that there is currently no automatic indexation of maximum charges and so shares that risk with the developer. If Council chooses not to adopt the Fair Value charges this financial risk remains, but will be transferred entirely to Council.

- Applicants may also seek to have conditioned unidentified non trunk infrastructure that also services other development they believe to be trunk converted to trunk for the purposes of calculating offsets and refunds via a new conversion process. The outcome of this process may be appealed. Criteria to be used in assessing the merits of the conversion process are to be included in the final statutory guideline which isn't available at the time of drafting this report.
- Council must now produce a Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP). It replaces what was a Priority Infrastructure Plan (PIP). They are similar in most parts. There is now an additional requirement that the LGIP must demonstrate that the Schedule of Works (SOW) contained in the plan is financially sustainable. The Chief Financial Officer of Council must now sign off on the LGIP to this effect. A model SOW is provided, but is not mandatory. An equivalent local model is acceptable provided it performs the equivalent function. The LGIP must be reviewed by a third party State accredited agency/assessor/consultant. It is believed that Council is liable for the cost of this service. The draft PIP in the planning scheme will automatically become an LGIP when Council adopts the new planning scheme; however, Council will be required to amend the LGIP to be fully compliant with new requirements by 1 July, 2016.
- The Bill has clarified avenues for appeal to the Planning and Environment Court and a Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committee. The base regulated charge rates and the outcome of the new establishment cost valuation methodology cannot be appealed. The application of the charges, timing of refunds and the outcome of the trunk infrastructure conversion process may.
- On a positive note the new arrangements have removed the provision that councils may be required to levy 'Local Function' charges on behalf of the State for demand created on State infrastructure such as Main Roads. Also the issuing of a Final Building Certificate has now been established as a trigger for the issuing of an ICN. This ensures that even building work that is privately certified can trigger an ICN. This will be important under the new Planning Scheme as it provides for more self-assessable development.

RISK ASSESSMENT

New significant risks are summarised below, however a more detailed explanation is included in Attachment 1. It is very difficult to model the actual financial impacts of most of the changes because of the number and unpredictability of inputs. However revenue outcomes for various charge scenarios are being developed.

Maximum Charge Indexation:

In the event councils choose not to opt for the Fair Value charges, the maximum charges will over time increasingly limit Council's ability to maintain adopted charges that reflect the actual cost of delivering the trunk infrastructure contained in the LGIP. This impact will be further exacerbated if the Minister chooses to not index the current maximum charges (they have not been indexed in three years). The introduction of mandated offsets, refunds and cross crediting and the option for applicants to seek a real time valuation of conditioned works for the purposes of calculating offsets ensures that over the medium to long term the community will be asked to take on an increasingly bigger share of trunk infrastructure costs or accept a lower level of service from trunk infrastructure networks.

Mandated Offsets and Refunds:

Mandating offsets, refunds and cross crediting also directly increases the financial risk to Council. At the moment, Council provides reasonable consideration of offsets associated with trunk works completed by the developer. The offsets are negotiated and included in an infrastructure agreement.

Council has negotiated refunds only in special circumstances and did not allow cross crediting. Charges are capped and do not necessarily reflect the cost of delivering services. There is also no automatic indexation of the maximum charge unless Council opt for the Fair Value schedule. In the past the negotiation would occur in this context. The new prescriptive arrangements allow little room in the negotiation for these risks to be fairly shared.

Governance:

The new arrangements purport to clarify and simplify. However, there is a real risk that the additional processes for resolving applicable offsets and refunds and the trunk conversion process will increase the number of appeals and further extend and complicate the assessment process. This will ultimately cost Council more and frustrate the development community. The new financial sustainability requirements associated with an LGIP may exacerbate this.

LGIP Approval:

There is a requirement that the LGIP demonstrates financial sustainability and alignment with the Long Term Financial Model. The form that this must take and level of financial rigor is not clear and may ultimately impose additional costs on Council. The mandatory LGIP third party assessment process may have a similar impact on engineering resources. It is also not clear how a disagreement between Council and the accreditation agency will be resolved. As the LGIP remains part of the Planning Scheme, the State lever will be a refusal by the Minister to support the adoption or amendment of a planning scheme. Given the potential implications for Council's growth and service levels there must be some concern that this introduces a further unnecessary risk and control for Council.

NEXT STEPS

- Development assessment processes have been reviewed and adjusted as necessary to ensure statutory compliance. This work will be ongoing as the State finalises associated Statutory and non-statutory guidance.
- A new AICR (No.4) will soon be presented to Council for adoption. Although not a strict requirement until 1 July 2015, an updated AICR to incorporate the new requirements will greatly assist transparency and an efficient assessment process. The new legislation already prevails over parts of the current AICR No. 3. A new compliant AICR is being prepared and will be proposed in conjunction with a report that considers the Fair Value charges option. It is hoped this can occur by the end of August.
- As above Council has the option to consider adopting the Fair Value charges schedule. Once the final details of this program are clarified a further report will be presented to Council to facilitate this decision.
- Council must produce a compliant Local Government Infrastructure Plan by 1 July 2016. The current draft PIP will automatically become an LGIP if the Planning Scheme is adopted. However, it is likely amendments will be required to the SOW to make it fully compliant by 1 July, 2016.
- The new requirements for the Schedule of Works (SOW) and third party accreditation remain an uncertain cost and risk to Council. Further advice will be provided to Council once the statutory guideline for preparation of an LGIP is finalised.

CONCLUSION

The legislative changes that commenced on 4 July have shifted additional financial and governance risk to Council. The changes further limit Council's ability to establish, levy and maintain infrastructure charges that keep pace with the real cost of infrastructure delivery. The changes will also potentially increase the time to resolve disputes related to infrastructure charging due to more complex negotiations and expanded appeal rights.

To mitigate some of these risks, Council will consider the merits of adopting the Fair Value infrastructure charges schedule once all the details become available. This may continue to be complicated by the uncertainty surrounding asset sales in the near term.

The requirement to develop a LGIP to replace the current PIP comes with the need for third party accreditation and financial verification. The full impacts cannot be fully assessed yet, but will almost certainly increase the cost of producing the LGIP over the current requirements for a PIP.

Although the full impact of the changes will not be understood for some time, Council should remain vigilant to the very real impact on Council revenues and resources that these changes potentially engender.

Although the full impact of the changes will not be understood for some time, Council should remain vigilant to the very real impact on Council revenues and resources that these changes potentially engender.

QUEENSLAND'S INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND CHARGING FRAMEWORK CHANGES BRIEFING

Infrastructure Planning and Charging Changes explained

Meeting Date: 8 July 2014

Attachment No: 1

Report



Attachment 1

<i>Term</i>	<i>Key Amendments</i>	<i>RRC Consequences</i>
Credit	Lawful uses when established have paid charges or completed conditioned works to contribute to the provision of trunk infrastructure (or should have). A new development should therefore only pay for any additional demand they create. The charge equivalent of any existing use right that exists on a property in this way is called a credit. A consideration of credits in this way is now mandatory for all councils.	RRC has always applied a credit for existing lawful uses on the land when calculating infrastructure charges. Under the new arrangements Council is required to provide a credit for any use the proponent can demonstrate to have legally existed on the land at any stage of history. This goes beyond the current approach and some quite perverse outcomes or propositions may be considered by developers, however it is unlikely to have a significant material impact on revenues.
Offset	Councils may condition a new development to provide trunk infrastructure works required to service their development or for additional costs if the development is inconsistent with LGIP assumptions. Councils are now required to reduce the value of the ICN (see below) by the establishment cost of the works. The value is by default the establishment cost in the LGIP or as calculated using a new valuation	Council negotiated offsets and these were included in an Infrastructure Agreement up until 4 July 2014. The value was negotiable, but the Schedule of Works in the AICR was the principle reference. As discussed Council maintained this position to mitigate the impact of capped charges and no automatic indexation of the caps. The mandatory changes mean Council must consider offsets for all conditioned trunk

Committee Name

Report

Report (Cont.)

	<p>methodology to be contained in the AICR. This methodology is used when the conditioned works are not identified in the LGIP or the applicant believes the value does not reflect the true cost of the works. Offsets are now mandated and must be considered by Council when calculating the ICN. Developers can challenge the value up to the date the charge falls due.</p>	<p>works and the proponents are able to have a real time valuation completed and to have the valuation used for the calculation of the offset or refund (see below). The potential risk can be mitigated to some extent if Council opts for the Fair Value charges as these maximum charges are automatically indexed annually. Of course Council would still have to decide to adopt the indexed charges to fully mitigate the risk.</p>
<p>Refund</p>	<p>If the value of the offset exceeds the value of the assessed charges than any charge in the ICN is cancelled and a refund of the difference between the assessed charges and the establishment cost of the conditioned works must be paid to the developer. The timing of the refunds must now be included in the ICN and the timing may be appealed.</p>	<p>Council has only considered refunds as part of the more traditional head works agreements up until now. The requirement to specify a time for payment effectively transfers all trunk infrastructure risk to Council. In the event other development reliant on the trunk infrastructure does not happen in accordance with the SOW, Council is potentially left with stranded unused capacity in major networks. The timing and location of development is always uncertain in the medium to long term. This measure has the potential to impact long term financial sustainability. One way of mitigating these risks would be to reduce the PIA to only provide for a bare 10 years of growth (see below).</p>

Committee Name **Report**

Report (Cont.)

<p>Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP)</p>	<p>offers an expanded list of development categories aligned with current Queensland Planning Provision uses. The AICR may continue to contain the Schedule of Works (Trunk Infrastructure) until a LGIP is adopted. At that time the SOW in the LGIP automatically replaces the SOW in the AICR. The AICR must now also contain the methodology for calculating the establishment cost of works or land in the event they are not in the LGIP or the applicant does not agree with the LGIP valuation. New AICRs will not take effect until they are posted on Councils website.</p> <p>The LGIP replaces the Priority Infrastructure Plan. The major elements of an LGIP are the same as a PIP. One notable difference is that the LGIP is required to demonstrate that the works contained in the schedule are financially sustainable for council. The Chief Financial Officer is required to sign off the plan and it must ultimately align with asset management plans and long term financial models. The level of rigor required to establish this is not clear at this stage. The other major difference is the requirement for a third party review by a State accredited agency, it is</p>	<p>Other parts of the AICR can continue, including the SOW until replaced by the PIP (LGIP) once adopted as part of the planning scheme. Importantly Council will still require an AICR. In deciding the next AICR Council will need to consider whether to opt for the Fair Charges schedule and whether to consider any indexation of current residential charges as these are still well below the Fair Value rates.</p> <p>The new financial sustainability measures to be modelled in the Schedule of Works (SOW) are still not well understood at any level. The cost and resourcing requirements to support the third party accreditation process are also still not established. There is little doubt they will increase the costs of developing and maintaining a LGIP. Negotiation with DSDIP will be ongoing. At time of drafting the final Statutory guideline for preparing a LGIP is not available.</p>
--	---	--

Committee Name **Report**

Report (Cont.)

	believed at Council's cost.	
Schedule of Works (SOW)	A PIP contains a SOW. It currently provides a schedule of future trunk works for each network and a value of the work. The new Statutory guideline provides a model template for a LGIP SOW. There is an expectation that the SOW will now provide a more sophisticated financial model of council's trunk infrastructure capital works program.	At this stage the operation and cost of developing a compliant SOW are still being assessed.
Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA)	Council is required to identify an area that can accommodate 10 to 15 years of planned growth. Inside the PIA councils may condition development to construct trunk infrastructure necessary to service the development. Council may condition development outside or partly outside the PIA for the full cost of the delivery of trunk infrastructure to service that development.	The current draft PIP contains a PIA to accommodate at least 15 years of development. This was done to provide certainty and confidence for investors. The amendments summarised here shift financial risk back to Council. Development outside the PIA can still be held accountable for all additional costs of delivering trunk infrastructure to service the development without the mandated requirement for offsets, refunds or cross crediting. Council could give consideration to reducing the planning horizon for the PIA to the minimum 10 years to help mitigate the risks outlined above.

QUEENSLAND'S INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND CHARGING FRAMEWORK CHANGES BRIEFING

Fair Value Infrastructure Charges Schedule

Meeting Date: 8 July 2014

Attachment No: 2

Report



Attachment 2

Fair Value Infrastructure Charges Schedule

Column 1 Use category	Column 2 Use	Column 3 (A) Charge category	Column 3 (B) Charge
Residential	Dwelling house	\$ per 2 bedroom dwelling	\$18,000.00
		\$ per 3 or more bedroom dwelling	\$25,200.00
	Dwelling unit	\$ per 1 bedroom dwelling	\$15,000.00
		\$ per 2 bedroom dwelling	\$18,000.00
		\$ per 3 or more bedroom dwelling	\$25,200.00
	Caretaker's accommodation	\$ per 1 bedroom dwelling	\$15,000.00
		\$ per 2 bedroom dwelling	\$18,000.00
		\$ per 3 or more bedroom dwelling	\$25,200.00
	Multiple dwelling	\$ per 1 bedroom dwelling	\$15,000.00
		\$ per 2 bedroom dwelling	\$18,000.00
		\$ per 3 or more bedroom dwelling	\$25,200.00
	Dual occupancy	\$ per 1 bedroom dwelling	\$15,000.00
\$ per 2 bedroom dwelling		\$18,000.00	
\$ per 3 or more bedroom dwelling		\$25,200.00	
Accommodation (short term)	Hotel	\$ per 1 bedroom	\$7,500.00
		\$ per 2 bedrooms in a suite	\$9,000.00
		\$ per 3 or more bedrooms in a suite	\$12,600.00
	Short-term accommodation	\$ per 1 bedroom (<6 beds per room)	\$7,500.00
		\$ per 1 bedroom (6 + beds per room)	\$9,000.00
		\$ per 2 bedrooms in a suite	\$9,000.00
	Tourist park - caravan or tent	\$ per 3 or more bedrooms in a suite	\$12,600.00
		\$ per 1 caravan or tent site	\$4,200.00
Tourist park - cabins	\$ per cabin site	\$9,000.00	
Accommodation (long term)	Community residence	\$ per 1 bedroom in dwelling	\$13,000.00
		\$ per 2 bedrooms in a dwelling	\$15,000.00
		\$ per 3 or more bedrooms in a dwelling	\$19,000.00
	Rooming accommodation	\$ per 1 bedroom (<6 beds per room)	\$13,000.00
		\$ per 1 bedroom (6 + beds per room)	\$15,000.00
		\$ per 2 bedrooms in a suite	\$15,000.00
		\$ per 3 or more bedrooms in a suite	\$19,000.00
	Relocatable home park	\$ per 1 bedroom relocatable dwelling site	\$13,000.00
		\$ per 2 bedroom relocatable dwelling site	\$15,000.00
		\$ per 3 bedroom relocatable dwelling site	\$19,000.00
Retirement facility	\$ per 1 bedroom dwelling	\$13,000.00	

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY

Committee Name **Report**
Report (Cont.)

	Shopping centre (medium= 30,001 - 60,000m ² GFA)	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$143.00
	Shopping centre (large = 60,001 + m ² GFA)	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$133.00
Commercial (office)	Office	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$119.00
	Sales office	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$119.00
Education facility	Child care centre	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$119.00
	Community care centre	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$119.00
	Educational establishment (primary school)	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$119.00
	Educational establishment (secondary school)	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$119.00
	Educational establishment for the Flying Start for Qld Children Program	Nil charge	Nil
	Educational establishment (tertiary)	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$119.00
Entertainment	Bar	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$170.00
	Hotel (non-residential component)	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$170.00
	Nightclub	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$170.00
	Theatre	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$170.00
Indoor sport and recreation	Indoor sport and recreation (squash or other court areas)	\$ per m ² GFA of court area plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$17.00
	Indoor sport and recreation (other)	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$170.00
Industry	Low impact industry	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$42.50
	Marine industry	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$42.50
	Medium impact industry	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$42.50
	Research and technology industry	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$42.50
	Rural industry	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$17.00
	Transport Depot	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$42.50
	Warehouse (self storage facility)	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$42.50
	Warehouse (other)	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$42.50
High impact industry	High impact industry	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$59.50
	Special industry	\$ per m ² GFA plus \$8.50 per m ² impervious area	\$59.50

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY

Committee Name _____ Report _____

Report (Cont.)

	Telecommunications facility	Nil charge	Nil
	Temporary uses	Nil charge	Nil
Other uses *	A use not otherwise listed in column 2	The maximum adopted charge is the charge (in column 3(A) and 3(B)) for a use category (in column 2) that appropriately reflects the use at the time of assessment	

DRAFT

NOT GOVERNMENT POLICY

10 NOTICES OF MOTION

Nil

11 URGENT BUSINESS/QUESTIONS

Urgent Business is a provision in the Agenda for members to raise questions or matters of a genuinely urgent or emergent nature, that are not a change to Council Policy and can not be delayed until the next scheduled Council or Committee Meeting.

12 CLOSED SESSION

In accordance with the provisions of section 275 of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, a local government may resolve to close a meeting to the public to discuss confidential items, such that its Councillors or members consider it necessary to close the meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the meeting be closed to the public to discuss the following items, which are considered confidential in accordance with section 275 of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, for the reasons indicated.

13.1 Outstanding Infrastructure Contributions and Infrastructure Charges

This report is considered confidential in accordance with section 275(1)(g) (h), of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, as it contains information relating to any action to be taken by the local government under the Planning Act, including deciding applications made to it under that Act; AND other business for which a public discussion would be likely to prejudice the interests of the local government or someone else, or enable a person to gain a financial advantage.

13 CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

13.1 OUTSTANDING INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS AND INFRASTRUCTURE CHARGES

File No: 8617
Attachments: Nil
Authorising Officer: Russell Claus - Manager Planning
Robert Holmes - General Manager Regional Services
Author: Tarnya Fitzgibbon - Coordinator Development
Assessment

This report is considered confidential in accordance with section 275(1)(g)(h), of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, as it contains information relating to any action to be taken by the local government under the Planning Act, including deciding applications made to it under that Act; AND other business for which a public discussion would be likely to prejudice the interests of the local government or someone else, or enable a person to gain a financial advantage.

SUMMARY

Since February 2014, staff have investigated 1) outstanding infrastructure contributions under Planning Scheme Policies (from November 1997 to 30 June 2011), and 2) outstanding infrastructure charges under the infrastructure charges regime that commenced on 1 July 2011. An update on this investigation will be presented to the meeting.

14 CLOSURE OF MEETING