



10 December 2021

Carmel Donnelly
Chair, Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal

By email: ipart@ipart.nsw.gov.au

Dear Ms Donnelly

Subject: Staff submission - Typical scopes and benchmark costs of local infrastructure - Information Paper 12 November 2021

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a staff submission on the Typical scopes and benchmark costs of local infrastructure - Information Paper- 12 November 2021.

The New South Wales Government proposal to incorporate the use of benchmark costs in the proposed reformed development contributions system is only one of many mechanisms to be used to reduce costs included in local infrastructure contributions plans. The cumulative effect of all proposed changes is likely to significantly reduce the contributions collected for infrastructure needed for growth, and place increased financial pressure on Council, and / or result in infrastructure shortfalls.

It is imperative that the final benchmark costs recommended are as accurate as possible. A detailed staff response is provided in Appendix A.

Lake Macquarie City Council staff welcome further engagement on the matters raised in this submission.

Should you wish to discuss, or require further information, please contact Deborah Scott, Development Contributions Coordinator on [REDACTED] or at [REDACTED].

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Wesley Hain
Manager Integrated Planning

Our Ref: Your Ref:

126-138 Main Road
Speers Point NSW 2284
Box 1906 HRMC NSW 2310

T 02 4921 0333
E council@lakemac.nsw.gov.au
W lakemac.com.au

 [lakemac](#)  [lakemaccity](#)  [ourlakemac](#)

ABN: 81 065 027 868



Appendix A – Staff response to Typical scopes and benchmark costs of local infrastructure - Information Paper 12 November 2021

(Supplementary Report – Benchmark Datasheets, Appendix A – Item and sub-item listing)

Reference	Comment
<p>1.01 New Local Road</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p><i>The following items should have a benchmark:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 x 3500mm and 1 x 2000m wide turfed grass nature strip <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Reference may be made to item 4.24 (turf) for additional information.</i> ○ <i>A sub item for embankment turf up to slopes of 1 in 4 is a common construction inclusion at LMCC (item not identified elsewhere).</i> ○ <i>A sub item for embankment planting to slopes of up to 1 in 2 with jute matting is a common construction inclusion at (item not identified elsewhere).</i> ○ <i>Underground water storage cells and / or retention (item not identified elsewhere).</i> ○ <i>Note that town centre roads require a higher quality surround landscape.</i> ○ <i>On Costs may not be sufficient - refer to general comments (below this table).</i> • Street Trees – semi mature 45L every 15m both sides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Council's standard detail for trees in turf street verges call up a minimum tree size of 75 litre.</i> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - No</i></p>

Our Ref: Your Ref:

126-138 Main Road
Speers Point NSW 2284
Box 1906 HRMC NSW 2310

T 02 4921 0333
E council@lakemac.nsw.gov.au
W lakemac.com.au



Reference	Comment
	<p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
<p>1.03 New collector road</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p><i>The following items should have a benchmark:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 x 1500mm and 1 x 2500m wide turfed grass nature strip <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Reference may be made to item 4.24 (turf) for additional information.</i> ○ <i>A sub item for embankment turf up to slopes of 1 in 4 is a common construction inclusion at LMCC (item not identified elsewhere).</i> ○ <i>A sub item for embankment planting to slopes of up to 1 in 2 with jute matting is a common construction inclusion at (item not identified elsewhere).</i> ○ <i>On Costs may not be sufficient - refer to general comments.</i> • 1 x 1.5m reinforced concrete footpath - 1500mm wide x 125mm thick concrete on 125mm thick DGS20 • 1 x 2.5 reinforced concrete share way – 2500mm wide x 150mm thick concrete on 125mm thick DGS20 • Street Trees – semi mature 45L every 15m both sides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Council typical shared path width is 3 metres. This width is more appropriate due to frequency of use of our shared paths.</i> ○ <i>Council’s standard detail for trees in turf street verges call up a minimum tree size of 75 litre.</i> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i></p>

Reference	Comment
	<p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p> <p>Wearing surface should be AC14</p>
<p>Item 1.04 New sub- arterial road</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 x 2.5m reinforced concrete footpath - 2500mm wide x 125mm thick concrete on 125mm thick DGS20 • 2 x 2500mm wide turfed grass nature strip <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>A sub item for embankment turf up to slopes of 1 in 4 is a common construction inclusion at LMCC (item not identified elsewhere).</i> ○ <i>A sub item for embankment planting to slopes of up to 1 in 2 with jute matting is a common construction inclusion at (item not identified elsewhere).</i> ○ <i>Council typical shared path width is 3 metres. This width is more appropriate due to frequency of use of our shared paths.</i> • Street Trees – semi mature 45L every 50m both sides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Council's standard detail for trees in turf street verges call up a minimum tree size of 75 litre. <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? – No</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p> <p>Wearing surface should be AC14</p>

Reference	Comment
Item 1.05 New industrial road	Wearing surface should be AC14 Design traffic for an industrial road is 1x10 ⁷ ESAs Minimum basecourse thickness is 160
Item 1.08 Upgrade to sub-arterial road	Wearing surface should be AC14
Item 1.14 Roundabout – single lane	Does not include road construction. No standard concrete pavement provided
Item 1.16 Reinforced concrete pathway	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p><i>The following items should have a benchmark:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The estimate appears reasonable for the typical detail provided however LMCC standard concrete shared path detail calls up 125mm thick concrete (iPART document uses 100mm) and 100mm base course (iPART document uses 75mm). Refer to general notes.</i> • <i>The detail Council has developed is to ensure longevity of our infrastructure. In addition, and further increasing the cost of some concrete pavements that we install, we specify a colour or finish that ties in with the unique local character or desired aesthetic of the site / area.</i> • <i>Designing places with beauty and character that people feel proud to belong to is consistent with the NSW Government’s proposed Design and Place SEPP.</i> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i></p>

Reference	Comment
	5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i>
1.20 Pedestrian / Cycleway bridge	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p><i>The following items should have a benchmark:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Architectural embellishment is listed as and exclusion however should be categorised as a sub item. Designing places with beauty and character that people feel proud to belong to is consistent with the NSW Government’s proposed Design and Place SEPP. Architectural embellishments are increasingly becoming a norm to celebrate culture and history of an area, such as Aboriginal heritage.</i> • <i>Proposed materials like recycled timber, weathered steel, composite wood and precast concrete are now commonly used and consistent with achieving the above.</i> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - No</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
1.23 Bus shelter	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p><i>The following items should have a benchmark:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Architectural elements and signage are increasingly becoming a norm to capture urban precinct culture and character.</i> • <i>Benchmark base cost should include advertisement and signage element.</i> • <i>Exclusions should include the TfNSW signage and information station.</i> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - No</i></p>

Reference	Comment
	<p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
<p>2.01 Culvert</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? – Yes</i></p> <p>The following items should have a benchmark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only single and twin cell RCBCs have been included from (1/300x225 to 2/2100x2100). Bigger culvert sizes and combinations should be included; • Handrails - Culverts can introduce large vertical drops. Depending on vicinity of pedestrian/vehicular activity handrails may be warranted long edges of culverts; and • Cast in-situ box culverts and custom box culvert construction
<p>2.02 Combined basin and raingarden</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark?</i></p> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear?</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs?</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability?</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice?</i></p> <p>Geotextile/geomembranes should be included as they are commonly used in construction, and are placed at the base of basins/raingardens.</p> <p>No mention of any major storm outlet treatment/treatment. Rip-rap/spillway for overflow.</p>
<p>2.03 Single raingarden facility</p>	<p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear?</i></p> <p>Geotextile/geomembranes should be included. Smaller structure so probably wouldn't have any major storm outlets</p>

Reference	Comment
2.08 Wetland Basin	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark?</i></p> <p>Add fencing, signage etc. They are required for permanent ponded water acting in wetland (wet basin).</p> <p>Concrete dish drains should be included for dry detention basins.</p>
2.10 Detention Basin/Enhances Storage Area	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark?</i></p> <p>Add fencing, signage etc. They are required for permanent ponded water acting in basin (unless it is designed as a 'dry' basin).</p> <p>Concrete dish drains should be included for dry detention basins.</p>
2.11 Gross Pollutant Trap	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark?</i></p> <p>There is no mention of larger, custom GPT unit (i.e Baramy style) - unsure of costs for larger units, \$/unit.</p>
2.13 Stormwater Pipe	<p>1. Scope inclusion or exclusion? - Subsoil pipes running alongside RCPs.</p> <p>2. RCP>Class 2</p> <p>3. Alternative pipes (e.g. Stormpro pipes used in certain difficult situations)</p>
2.14 Stormwater Headwalls	<p>1. Scope inclusion or exclusion? - Subsoil pipes also draining out of headwall</p>
2.15 Stormwater Pit	<p>1. Key Scope of Work Inclusions: includes if pits are less than 2m deep. What about if they are greater than 2m deep (would need custom designs)?</p> <p>2. Subsoil drainage</p> <p>3. Step irons typically required when Pit >1.2m deep. No mention of step irons.</p>

Reference	Comment
2.16 Stormwater channel/open channel	<i>Scope inclusion or exclusion?</i> – include subsoil pipes running below centre of channel (indicated in drawing but not in scope)
Other exclusions	<p>These items need to be included in a benchmark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creek bank stabilisation • Channel naturalisation • Riffle ponds along channels/creek beds • Retaining walls/gabion walls in stormwater works • ARR2019 to be included under applicable standards.
4.01 Amenities Building 100sqm	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark?</i> - Yes</p> <p>Surrounding landscape is generally required which may include either or a combination of hard and soft landscape. A sub item should be required.</p> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear?</i> – No</p> <p>Amenities building 400sqm (Item 4.01) highlights in the title that the building is 400sqm, but in the Inclusions list states a notional facility size of 100sqm. 100sqm may be appropriate for a tennis clubhouse (at the absolute minimum), but is not appropriate for a sports field amenities building which should be up to the allowable amount of 400sqm plus verandas along the access doors and canteen to provide shelter to enable their use. The size and number of amenities building will relate to the number of sports fields being serviced. For example: a larger building than 400sqm would be required for servicing four sports fields as opposed to two fields, or alternatively two amenities building may be required.</p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs?</i> - No</p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability?</i> - No</p>

Reference	Comment
	<p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
<p>4.02 BBQ area</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p>Inclusions should identify that the unit is to be accessible (as per AS1428 requirements). Accessible units typically cost more than non-accessible units.</p> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i> 3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i> 4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i> 5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? - No, see General Comments.</i></p>
<p>4.03 Boundary fence</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p>Include a sub item for different heights should be included: 1.2m height and 1.8m height.</p> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i> 3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i> 4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i> 5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
<p>4.04 Car park</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p>The following items should have a benchmark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The LMCC DCP calls up at least one advanced clear-trunked broad-canopy tree for every six at-grade car spaces.</i> • <i>The costed car park example in the iPART document has only six trees for 100 car spaces, therefore only one tree per 16 spaces.</i>

Reference	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Our DCP requirement therefore increases construction costs of our car parks compared to the iPART car park cost example.</i> • <i>Additional trees in such spaces is consistent with the Premier’s Priority ‘Greening Our City’, the proposed Design and Place SEPP as well as other relevant policies and guidelines to mitigate the urban heat island effect of infrastructure such as car parks.</i> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i> 3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i> 4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i> 5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
<p>4.08 Double playing fields</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark?</i></p> <p>The following items should have a benchmark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage and perimeter fencing costs. These are considered essential for all sports field developments. In the absence of benchmark costs, are Council’s able to provide these cost estimates on a case by case basis and include these as part of the overall cost of providing sportsground complexes within a S7.11 plan? • The installation of irrigation systems is standard practice in all new local sports field developments as it provides increased capacity for the use of sport fields, water sustainability management and meets the S7.11 framework for efficient design and delivery principles. • Item 4.08 playing fields does not provide for the provision of AFL fields with a turf cricket wicket overlay. AFL fields are considered as important to provide as rectangular field sports and should have a benchmark costing associated with these. To ensure year-round use of the field and increase capacity, an AFL field should have an overlay for cricket. This would require a turf wicket in the centre of the field, as a synthetic wicket is not appropriate. This should be considered base

Reference	Comment
	<p>level infrastructure in this specific instance and be allowed for in the costing of the facility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the playing field specifications, it states that drainage, perimeter fencing, amenities, floodlighting, car parking are excluded from the benchmark costing for Item 4.08 Double playing fields but may be reasonably required. While amenities, floodlighting and car parking have separate benchmark costs. <p><i>2. Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? – No</i></p> <p>The playing field specification (Item 4.08) has an exclusion list that identifies that spectator seating, irrigation sprinklers, equipment storage and cricket practice nets exceed the minimum requirements for sport fields in S7.11 plans. However, there are benchmark costs for Item 4.05 Cricket practice nets (3 bay), and Item 4.22 Spectator Seating. As there are benchmark costs, these should be removed from this exclusion list and placed within list that may be reasonably required.</p>
<p>4.09 Double playing lighting 100 lux</p>	<p><i>2. Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - No</i></p> <p>Item 4.09 deals with floodlighting for football fields, tennis courts and netball courts. It identifies that costings are based a specific number of poles and lights required to meet 100 lux. However, in Item 4.13 for netball courts, the exclusion list (but could be reasonably required) identifies that floodlighting for netball should be 200 lux. This requires clarification on what level is considered base requirements for netball 100 or 200 lux and what the base cost estimates are based on.</p>
<p>4.12 Basic landscaping</p>	<p><i>1. Are there other items that we should benchmark? – Yes</i></p>

Reference	Comment
	<p>The following items should have a benchmark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally, basic landscape here is referring to softscape and vegetation items only. Suggest additional items be added to capture some of the commonly included items like fertilisers, water retention agents and planting soils. • Additional items should include advanced trees up to 1000 L. This item incurs transport and delivery costs. Some landscapes require larger trees installations to mitigate urban heat island effect and to improve user comfort. • Applicable growing standards should be reference for quality assurance (AS 2303:2018). <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - No</i> 3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - No</i> 4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i> 5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
4.13 Netball courts with lighting	Item 4.13 Netball courts lighting / court appears to have an incorrect heading. Netball floodlighting costs are identified in Item 4.09.3. Item 4.13 should read Netball Courts only as floodlighting is noted on the exclusion list and referenced to 4.09.3.
4.16 Pathway	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p>Refer to items 1.05 and 4.17.</p> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i> 3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i> 4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i> 5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>

Reference	Comment
<p>4.17</p> <p>Paved area</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p>The following items should have a benchmark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Rigid segmental pavements – concrete, natural stone, cobble setts,</i> • <i>Expansion / isolation joints and sealers,</i> • <i>Gravel / cement stabilised pavements,</i> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
<p>4.18</p> <p>Picnic area</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p>The following items should have a benchmark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub item to be included: steel frame accessible picnic set, • Sub item for slats: materials like recycled timber, aluminium with wood grain, • Sub items should also include bench seat mounted over concrete base. <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
<p>4.19</p> <p>Playground</p>	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark?- Yes</i></p> <p>The following items should have a benchmark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rubber soft fall material as EPDM or TPV.

Reference	Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concrete mow strip under fencing. <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? – No</i></p> <p>Item 4.19 Playgrounds, Softfall, Fencing is very confusing to understand and does not provide clear guidance on what is considered base costing for the provision of a playground. It identifies a notional installation area of 400m². The costs in this item appear to only relate to the installation costs of play equipment pieces at different values, but does not prescribe a cost to the actual supply of the play equipment. It is not clear if costings for the provision of a playground of up to 400m² can be included.</p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - Yes</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
4.20 Seating area	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark?- Yes</i></p> <p>The following items should have a benchmark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all sub items, LMCC requires at least one arm rest to improve access for user (and as suggested in AS1428.2). • Sub item for slats - materials like recycled timber, aluminium with wood grain, • Bench seat mounted over concrete base, • Accessory items like charging stations. <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? Yes</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? No</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>

Reference	Comment
4.21 Shade sail	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p>Include high-quality shade cloth material that is UV rated and includes a 15 year warranty</p> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - Yes</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
4.22 Spectator seat	<p>1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark? - Yes</i></p> <p>There is a benchmark cost for spectator seating that only factors in the cost of buying the equipment, but does not include installation costs such as a concrete slab to sit this equipment on. Include benchmark cost for these items.</p> <p>2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear? - Yes</i></p> <p>3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs? - Yes</i></p> <p>4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability? - No</i></p> <p>5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice? – No, see General Comments</i></p>
4.23 Tennis court and lighting	<p>Item 4.23 Tennis court and lighting includes provision within the cost for 250 lux floodlighting. However, if Council was only providing floodlighting to an existing tennis courts to increase capacity for a new community then Item 4.09.2 would need to be used, but this is based on 100 lux level of floodlighting. This needs to be increased to 250 lux as it would be if a new facility was being created.</p>

Reference	Comment
4.24 Turfing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Are there other items that we should benchmark?</i> – no comment 2. <i>Are the inclusions, exclusions and typical scopes appropriate and clear?</i> - Yes 3. <i>Do the base costs reflect efficient costs?</i> - Yes 4. <i>Do the sub items and adjustments appropriately deal with project variability?</i> - No 5. <i>Do the project allowances for on-costs and contingency reflect efficient practice?</i> – No, see General Comments

Please note: that some of the items listed above were identified and costed in the previous *Local Infrastructure Benchmark Costs: Costing infrastructure in Local Infrastructure Plans (April 2014)*.

General Comments

The Council on-cost, as indicated in section 7.6 of the Draft Benchmarking Items and Costing Methodology report appears to be low for small-scale projects (<\$250K). Small-scale projects typically have a higher percentage of on-cost and projects that have a small construction budget may well exceed the estimated 22% as provided in the report.

Likewise, with Aboriginal heritage studies. If an AHIP is required, the percentage of the construction cost may well exceed the 10% cost indicated as provided in the report.

Lake Macquarie Council Local Government Area (LGA) typically sits on a geologically modified surface and sub surface, starting from the Industrial Revolution, particularly the mining industry. Contamination from this industry are still felt at almost all of our public spaces and at the many kilometres of our lake shores.

Typical contamination in the Lake Macquarie LGA includes acid sulphate soils, asbestos (in both friable and non-friable form), ‘Black Grit’ (a by-product from the smelters used at landfill sites during the 70s and the 80s). Costs incurred in mitigating these risks of contaminated soils and sub-strata including preparation of, implementation and monitoring of a management plan will most likely increase our construction costs considerable.

Land subsidence due to mining and its mitigation is another area which will escalate our construction cost further. The Council has documented evidence such as supporting investigation reports, and/or spatial

datasets that address factors such as acid sulphate soil, mining subsidence etc.(Section 8 of 'Draft Benchmarking Items and Costing Methodology prepared by IPART 27 Oct 2021).

There is a continuous upgrade of trends and newer materials in the market that may not be captured in this document. Therefore, regular review and updates should occur.

It should be noted the construction price index is currently increasing significantly more than past trends.