

Regulatory, Planning and Assessment.MBisson/SCross
Phone: 4974 2000

10 December 2021

Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal
Attention: Ms Carmel Donnelly – Tribunal Chair
PO Box K35
HAYMARKET POST SHOP 1240

Email: ipart@ipart.nsw.gov.au

Dear Ms Donnelly

REVIEW OF THE ESSENTIAL WORKS LIST, NEXUS, EFFICIENT DESIGN AND BENCHMARK COSTS FOR LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Thank you for the invitation to provide written comment on the draft findings and recommendations discussed in the Draft Report, dated 29 October 2021 and opportunity for City of Newcastle (CN) staff to attend a workshop in September 2021 with a follow up meeting to further discuss relevant matters. This submission also responds to the report containing benchmark costs for local infrastructure items prepared by Cardno Pty Ltd (please refer to **Attachment A**).

CN understands that the NSW Government is proposing a package of reforms to the infrastructure contributions system and has asked IPART to provide advice to inform two key areas under two separate terms of reference concerning:

- an Essential Works List (EWL) that would apply to all section 7.11 contributions plans and the approach councils should use to determine the most efficient local infrastructure to meet the needs of new development, applying the principle of nexus
- standardised benchmark costs for local infrastructure that councils may use to prepare local contributions plans that reflect the efficient costs of provision.

Please be advised that at the Ordinary Council meeting on 24 August 2021 it was resolved:

"That Council:

- ...3. Calls on the NSW Government to de-couple the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal led review on population growth from the infrastructure contributions reforms.*
- ...5. Affirms its support to LGNSW and requests LGNSW continue advocating on our behalf to protect local government from any amendments to infrastructure contributions which leaves councils and communities exposed to expending ratepayer funds on new infrastructure made necessary by new development that is currently the responsibility of developers."*

The Resolution is provided in full at **Attachment B**.

CN commends the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces, for listening to the concerns of councils and making changes to the draft legislation to allow "councils that currently fund community infrastructure from developer contributions to continue to do so". It is unclear how community infrastructure will be considered in a revised EWL and relevant benchmark costs.

Government Reform – List of key issues for stakeholder comment

This submission has been prepared to address the questions posed by IPART in the Draft Report dated 29 October 2021.

While it is understood that advice provided by IPART only considers the contributions that councils can recover from developers for base level infrastructure, it is important to recognise that the other funding mechanisms such as ' planning agreements, grants or other sources may not be a suitable or available option and CN opposes shifting costs associated with local infrastructure required to meet the demand from new development and growth onto rate payers.

It would not be a reasonable outcome to apply the shortfall to existing households/ratepayers and it would be contrary to the core principle of the legislative provisions to enable a contribution from "*development that will or is likely to require the provision of or increase the demand for public amenities and public services within the area*".

1. Do you think our proposed principles-based approach to the EWL, as part of our broader framework incorporating efficient design and delivery and benchmark costs, provides enough certainty? Have we got the balance right between flexibility and certainty?

The principles-based framework proposed to allow councils to assess what infrastructure can be included comprises of the following components:

- i) The items included in the contributions plan must be on the EWL.
- ii) The items must be development contingent.
- iii) The costs in the plan must be based on the cost of base level infrastructure that meets efficient design and delivery principles.
- iv) If there is a relevant benchmark cost, that should be used unless it would not be reasonable to do so. Where a benchmark is not used, the council should apply the costing approach outlined in our report.
- v) Plans may be updated to reflect actual costs during the life of the plan, in some circumstances. Where this is not reasonable, the plan may continue to reflect an updated cost estimate.

Components i)-iii) above are considered too restrictive and are not supported. There is also uncertainty around items that are strictly development contingent and costs/provision of base level infrastructure. While these requirements may guide expected items and costs in future section 7.11 plans, they do not provide flexibility or adequately support infill development.

Relevant and realistic benchmark costs, if reasonable, can support greater certainty and fairer application of section 7.11 contributions rates. While they have potential to reduce plan administration, they should only be a guideline and infill benchmark costs should be developed as their base level is likely higher than a greenfield site.

Removing base level embellishment of open space

The proposed changes to the way the EWL are expressed is an improvement. The concept of 'base level' applying to more than just open space embellishment is supported. However, there are concerns that it still limits contributions for recreational facilities such as pools/pool upgrades, baseball field and amenities, district sports fields, enclosed dog exercise areas, district level playground or skate/BMX facilities. CN have committed to providing parks and playgrounds, sporting grounds and recreation facilities in accordance with its adopted plans and strategies and will need to ensure future development reasonably contributes to them.

Excluding works for community facilities

IPART's terms of reference state that works for community facilities must not be included in the EWL, and thus should not be paid for by developers. The EWL currently only applies to section 7.11 contributions plans that exceed the Ministerial thresholds/caps and therefore many councils that have not been exceeding the cap have been including contributions for community facilities and have committed to delivering this vital infrastructure to support new development and growth.

Applying the EWL to all future section 7.11 contributions plans, not just IPART reviewed/approved contributions plans, means that councils would not be able to seek contributions for new or upgraded community facilities.

The proposed approach may result in perverse community outcomes. CN currently collect and have committed to new and/or embellishment of library floorspace, community space floorspace and cultural space floorspace in infill areas with land also needed in identified greenfield areas.

Including strata space for community facilities

Including strata space for community spaces will not support the additional community space and CN's strategy to providing it.

Including borrowing costs

CN is not supportive of shifting costs/borrowing against future rates revenue to help fund community facilities. The rate peg adjustment for population growth will not create sufficient revenue for community facilities in CN.

Other changes

CN are pleased to see "and/or" inserted (Box 4.1 below) into the draft decision as there are scenarios where land is not required but a facility or additional floor space/embellishment is required to support future growth/development.

Box 4.1 Proposed essential works list

- Land and/or facilities for open spaces
Land or strata space for community facilities
- Land and/or facilities for transport
- Land and/or facilities for stormwater management
- The costs of plan preparation and administration
- Borrowing costs to forward fund infrastructure.

The proposed EWL will impact on CN's ability to meet service needs and residents' expectations and is a key issue raised by councils in submissions on the Final NSW Productivity Report. This shortfall in funding would need to be found elsewhere. CN do not agree that funds should be borrowed against future rates revenue to help fund these costs.

The balance between flexibility and certainty has not been achieved. The proposal does not support areas with medium to high levels of infill growth. The only suitable option may be the new section 7.12 planning legislation, yet the rates remain too low.

2. *Is the proposed evidence to establish nexus for infrastructure in a contributions plan appropriate and reasonable? Is there any other guidance on nexus for local infrastructure that should be included in an updated practice note to assist councils, developers and other stakeholders in preparing and assessing contributions plans?*

Yes, the three overarching principles guide nexus, being:

- i) That the expected development creates a demonstrable increase in the demand for public amenities and services.
- ii) That the types of public facilities proposed in the contributions plan are required to address that demand, having regard to the characteristics, needs and preferences of the new development/population.
- iii) That the proposed facilities consider the extent to which existing facilities have capacity to meet that demand.

Nexus is generally established with reference to precinct planning. Changes over time in design standards, technology and costs, as well as community expectations and infrastructure needs, are accommodated through regular review. It is agreed that regular review is required. However, too many precincts and many different section 7.11 contributions rates within LGAs create a clunky and confusing system for customers/developers and planners and this approach doesn't support the principle of simplicity, which is a guiding principle for change in this reform.

Providing sufficient open space for new and expanding communities is an important part of precinct planning and is not simply a numerical approach as there are other criteria required to ensure it is fit for purpose and meets needs.

The Draft Report refers to the need for technical studies and relevant planning strategies to inform section 7.11 contributions plans yet it is unclear if there will be sufficient funding available through section 7.11 contributions under the proposed regime. Most councils fund studies required for contributions plans from contributions. This may not be possible under the proposed regime given lack of contributions that may be available.

The broader definition of development-contingent open space is supported as nexus can be established for open space outside of the precinct and for co-located or shared facilities.

3. What further guidance on base level, efficient local infrastructure should be included in an updated practice note to assist councils, developers and other stakeholders in preparing and assessing contributions plans? How definitively should the guidance in an updated practice note specify the standards expected of infrastructure (e.g. legislation and other industry standards)?

CN do not agree that all section 7.11 contributions plans should be restricted to base level infrastructure. Similar to other councils, CN is committed to delivering the level of service its community expects and needs as reflected in the Community Strategic Plan and other relevant strategies. CN objects to the proposed funding shortfall that will occur in providing infrastructure to a reasonable and expected standard if this approach is adopted.

DPIE are encouraged to update the relevant practice note to ensure that councils clearly understand items that can be included in contributions plans. It is assumed that skate parks, BMX tracks, pools and indoor recreation facilities are not considered as base level unless base level can be justified. However, this is not clear.

Allowing for climate change, providing value for money and efficient staging and timing of works is acknowledged as good practice. Councils constantly battle with costs increasing over the life of a section 7.11 plan. Guidance on reasonable costs and regular review of items and costs is important. It is agreed, that in some cases it may be more cost-effective to upgrade or improve existing infrastructure in infill areas rather than invest in new infrastructure and options need to be available to support this approach. This is CN's current approach as reflected in CN's newly adopted Section 7.11 contributions plan. However, the benchmark costs need to adequately capture waste removal and public utilities for infill scenarios.

CN agrees that options for innovation such as dual and shared use of open space and community facilities should be considered.

4. Are there other items that we should consider benchmarking?

To support a simpler (less administrative) yet robust system, an acceptable range of standardised benchmark costs with options for site-specific costing should be included in an updated practice note. It is understood that benchmarks focus on base level infrastructure only. However, off road paths (including shared), cycleways and cycling infrastructure should be included/better specified. CN is currently implementing an updated Cycling Plan as part of its ambition to be a smart, liveable and sustainable global city. Changing how we travel is a big part of this goal. New and upgraded foot/shared paths are necessary to support growth and considered development-contingent in our infill areas and also within greenfield development.

If justification could be made for base level skate parks, BMX tracks, pools and indoor recreation facilities, benchmark costings would be of assistance.

Given Minister Stokes' announcement on 24 November 2021, to modify the package to "include allowing councils that currently fund community infrastructure from developer contributions to continue to do so", it is recommended to include a benchmark for community facilities and spaces not just community strata space.

Additionally, it has been identified that public utilities is a cost not reflected in the costings nor is waste removal, particularly for waste that cannot be recycled/is contaminated, which is important to factor in for infill areas.

5. Do you agree with our approach to use adjustment factors so that the benchmarks are applicable to a broader range of projects?

Yes. The intent to account for variations between different sites and circumstances, including greenfield and infill developments, or in regional or metro locations is required.

It has been recognised by internal staff that standardised benchmark costs can be very useful to guide contributions plans. Some flexibility is required so costs can be determined by using the standardised benchmarked costs or by using a site-specific costing approach (including actual costs, where the infrastructure has already been constructed). Alternatively, a range could be proposed.

6. What other factors increase the complexity of a project that could be used as an adjustment factor?

Costs generally increase over time. There are instances where land filling and other issues arise. This is particularly the case in greenfield development where open space and recreation facilities are often positioned on lower value/swampy/low lying land which increases the costs to deliver the infrastructure and contingencies are not sufficient.

7. We seek stakeholder views on the approach to project allowances, including the rates and their application

It is important that allowances for inclusions such as contingencies, project management and design are factored into section 7.11 contributions plans. As stated in the Draft Report, contingency is an allowance that accounts for the level of uncertainty within a project. For example, greater contingency has been required this past year since Covid has impacted the availability of building supplies. It is agreed that uncertainty in cost and extent of a project is greatest in the early stages of project planning and reduces as more accurate information about the project is known. Guidance to support fair and reasonable allowances is welcomed. The recommended project allowances to be applied to base costs at the rates proposed under Table 7.3 and Table 7.4 are considered reasonable.

8. We seek stakeholder views on alternative benchmarks for open space. Is there value in a per person benchmark? How would it work?

An alternative approach to benchmarking for the embellishment of open space is supported and required to account for intensity of use in infill areas, which could require a higher level of infrastructure to meet the base level need. This is particularly relevant to CN LGA. Further consideration with councils on a benchmark for open space is recommended. In CN LGA (outside greenfield area) CN requires a section 7.11 contribution of \$3,174.73 per person toward parks and playgrounds network embellishment and \$738.31 per person toward sporting grounds and recreation facilities network improvements. This does not include pool upgrades. Higher contributions are required in potential greenfield area.

CN took an approach to seek section 7.11 contributions for significant embellishment of existing facilities (outside greenfield area) that will be required to cater for additional usage from the forecast additional population rather than requiring additional public open space per person or using industry accepted benchmarks, which would have generated demand for new sportsgrounds - based on 1 sportsground per 3,000 persons with a minimum area of 3 hectares, playgrounds in local parks of approximately 1.5 hectares in area within 400m walking distance of all dwellings - based on 1 playground per 1,500 persons, new sports courts - based on 1 multipurpose court per 3,000 persons, new swimming centre - based on 1 centre per 17,500 persons and approximately one third contribution to a new leisure centre - based on 1 leisure centre per 60,000 persons.

Open space functions include sports spaces/fields, parks, natural spaces (including environmental reserves), beaches, lakes and rivers and urban/civic spaces. Recreation facilities within open space can include indoor recreation (courts and fitness), formal and informal sports (outdoor courts), recreation and surf clubs, playgrounds, skate/BMX parks and youth spaces, outdoor exercise facilities and exercise groups, off-leash dog areas, adventure sports, community gardens, an inland swimming pool or ocean bath.

The [Newcastle Parkland and Recreation Strategy 2014](#) and [Strategic Sports Plan 2020](#) contains CN's adopted principles and benchmarks for open space and recreational facilities. CN is also in the process of preparing a City-Wide Social Infrastructure Strategy and investigating benchmarks.

Contributions per person/catchment should be influenced by open space analysis that considers quantity, size, shape and function, accessibility, connectivity and distribution and quality of open space. This approach seeks to think about open space planning and provision more holistically, moving away from a quantity-only based approach and instead towards a performance-based approach that encourages identifying opportunities and solutions based on a range of factors included above such as accessibility, connectivity and distribution, size, shape and function, quality of recreation opportunities. It is evident that with increasing densities and declining land supply, the typical approach of setting aside a quantum of land as part of every development is no longer effective. Rather than focusing on quantity only, we need to consider what recreation opportunities are required and what are the strategies available to achieve them in innovative and efficient ways.

It is also acknowledged in the section 7.11 plan that CN's existing and future populations also generate a demand for high quality urban spaces in addition to traditional parks and sportsgrounds. This includes areas of the public domain in town centres and comprises, plazas, malls, street edges and the like and a contribution (based on apportionment) is made for such infrastructure.

9. Does 1.5% of the total value of works excluding land broadly reflect the actual cost councils face to administer a contributions plan? If not, what percentage would better reflect the actual cost councils face?

It is recommended that at least 2% (up to 3%) is required for plan administration particularly as increased reporting and regular review of contributions is required under the proposed changes to support the State Government's initiatives for greater transparency and accountability. Preparing and/or updating Plans has become very complex and there are limited contributions specialists available so 1.5% of the total value of works excluding land may not be a true representation of an appropriate rate to support better practice. This is particularly the case for CN who only has one contributions officer and occasionally seeks assistance from specialist consultants (if possible). Due to the complexity of the system, often legal advice is sought to ensure proper preparation and implementation of contributions plans. Limiting plan administration costs is not going to support reforms that are aiming for improvements in keeping plans up to date and ensuring contributions are spent.

It is also recommended that technical studies/social infrastructure strategies required to inform section 7.11 plans are not included in the benchmark equal to a percentage based on the total value of works (ie 1.5% - 2%) but as a separate line item. Sufficient funds are required to ensure up to date and well-informed evidence-based plans.

10. What other types of information or data would provide a clear evidence base for the true costs of plan administration?

Follow up surveys/workshops/reports or information sharing on how many hours/staff/planning consultants are required to prepare and update contributions plans plus cover reporting and meeting all future legislative requirements. True plan administration requires time and skills from many staff within council (from finance to contributions planner, customer service, IT for charges and website updates/online tools, strategic and technical staff, asset and corporate planners plus civil construction and maintenance). In addition, external advice, including legal advice, is often required on top of internal matters.

11. We seek views on our proposed approach to annual escalations and 4 yearly reviews of benchmarks, including the choice of index and timeframe.

IPART should regularly update the benchmarks to account for cost escalations and carefully monitor benchmark costs in contributions plans to determine if an earlier review is required. CN expects to still index rates quarterly as required under the then repealed plans.

12. We seek views on an appropriate feedback or data collection mechanism to obtain reliable and consistent project information to refine the benchmarks over time.

CN staff would be happy to provide information and provide feedback over time. It is recommended that IPART prepare a relevant template (with councils) for councils to use and report back to IPART on.

13. Are the proposed principles and information requirements for councils using an alternative costing approach adequate? Should councils be required to provide any further information to justify deviations from the standard benchmark costs?

The proposed principles and information requirements for councils using an alternative costing approach appear adequate.

14. Are the proposed principles for reviewing plans and updating costs adequate? Are there any principles that should be removed from or added to this list?

The proposed principles for reviewing plans and updating costs appear adequate.

15. Are the proposed information requirements for councils enough? Are there any other pieces of information that should be added to this list?

The proposed information requirements for councils are sufficient.

16. Do you support our approach for a threshold to determine which plans must be reviewed?

Yes, the following approach seems reasonable to determine a review:

- councils relying more on benchmark cost estimates in the early years of a contributions plan
- contributions plans being updated to incorporate updates to benchmarks at appropriate intervals
- these benchmarks being gradually replaced with more accurate site-specific efficient cost estimates or actual costs based on efficient design at each four-yearly review as planning and delivery of infrastructure becomes more advanced over time.

17. Do you support our proposal for a fixed 4 yearly review of contributions plans?

Yes. However, there needs to be support, funds, tools and resources to be able to do this.

18. Does the annual update and four-yearly review provide an appropriate balance between cost reflectivity and certainty?

Yes, it does. It is reasonable that councils review the components of an actual cost and the drivers behind the deviation from the previous estimate.

Summary

CN staff support an improved approach to enhance the efficiency of the infrastructure contributions system and make it more accessible, consistent and simpler to administer.

We would be happy to elaborate on our submission. Should you have any questions, please contact [REDACTED]

Yours faithfully

Issue of this letter is authorised by [REDACTED]

cc Local Government NSW

ATTACHMENT A – BENCHMARK COSTS FOR LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE

It is recommended that benchmark costs/designs for infill development be developed as infill costs can be higher than the exhibited costs proposed by Cardno, which best support greenfield scenarios.

This attachment responds to the proposed benchmark items, typical scopes, base costs and adjustments, and allowances in the Supplementary Report - Benchmark Datasheets prepared by Cardno for IPART.

In general, the proposed IPART's benchmark costs for local infrastructure are supported. Our detailed review and comments are in the table below.

There are a number of factors that can vary the cost of a project which need to be factored into the benchmark costings for all proposed infrastructure. These include:

- Planning and project management – it is unclear how project management costs are factored into the overall costs and the approach.
- Relevant guidelines and legislative requirements - in some instances sporting codes require specific specifications for facilities rather than generic treatments as has been applied.
- Site preparation – site constraints and whether the infrastructure is to be located in a greenfield or infill area. Such constraints include contamination, topography and flooding.
- Availability of materials and labour – this can vary greatly from one year to another.
- Supply, delivery and installation.
- Costs to include public utility and sufficient costs for removal of waste, including non-recyclable material.

It is understood that benchmarks focus on base level infrastructure only. However, paths, cycleways and cycling infrastructure should be included. CN are currently implementing an updated [Cycling Plan](#) with an aim to get people on their bikes (keeping active) and off the road to reduce ongoing road upgrades. CN is striving to be a smart, liveable and sustainable global city and changing how we travel is a big part of this goal. New and upgraded foot/shared paths are necessary to support growth and considered development-contingent in our infill areas and greenfield development.

If justification could be made for base level skate parks, BMX tracks, pools and indoor recreation facilities, benchmark costings would assist.

With Minister Stokes' announcement made on 24 November 2021, to modify the package to "include allowing councils that currently fund community infrastructure from developer contributions to continue to do so", it is recommended a benchmark for community facilities and spaces be included.

CN has used IPART benchmarks over the years and find them very useful as a guide, with the option to refine where required to address any site-specific matters or constraints.

Contingencies are required. These must be clear and included in the overall cost. Benchmark costs for land fill and waste should be clear.

Reasonable standard ranges for benchmark costs could support greater efficiency in the plan making/review and updating process. Any benchmark costs will have to be regularly reviewed in consultation with councils.

A detailed review has been undertaken by CN's Estimator/Cost Control Officer (Civil Construction and Maintenance Team) in consultation with other relevant sections and relevant comments on benchmark costs are provided below.

Items have NOT been included where there is no CN comparison rate.

Cardno Benchmark Datasheet	Local Infrastructure	IPART Benchmark Rate	CN Comparison Rate	Exclusions	Site Constraint Factor	Additional Site Constraints
Item No. 1.01	New Local Road	\$2,300/Lm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site Establishment \$63.50/Lm - PU Investigation \$24/Lm - Excavation & Removal \$42/m² x 10 = \$420/Lm - Subsoil \$80/Lm x 2 = \$160/Lm - Subbase/base \$60/m² x 10 = \$600/Lm - Kerb and gutter \$76/Lm x 2 = \$152/Lm - Reinforced concrete footpath \$99/m² x 1.5 = \$148.50/Lm - Spray seal and asphalt \$48/m² x 8.1 = \$389/Lm - Topsoil and turf \$14/m² x 5.5 = \$77/Lm - Street trees \$40/Lm (provisional allowance) - Linemarking and signage \$20/Lm <p>Total <u>\$2,094/Lm</u> excl. stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Require more detail on stormwater drainage pipe/pits and how they have been factored into rates/design.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Raw material resource factor - Cultural heritage (incl. pavers, sandstone kerb) - Soil condition - On-costs 12-22% - Planning 20% - Design 15% <p>Other exclusions include: Guardrail and guide posts, street lighting, street furniture, tree removal and excavation of rock and night works.</p>	<p>Typically CN <i>New Local Road</i> sites are Moderately to Highly Constrained and require 20-40% markup to cover traffic control, minor public utility adjustments and bulk waste recycling.</p> <p>Note: Bulk waste recycling approx. \$50/m² x 10m = \$500/Lm excl. stormwater drainage.</p>	<p>A common additional CN site constraint includes non-recyclable bulk waste material.</p> <p>Non-recyclable bulk waste material includes coal tar, slag pavement and various remnants from heavy industry.</p> <p>The additional cost to dispose of non-recyclable bulk waste material is typically around 40% of the total project cost.</p> <p>Another common additional site constraint includes major public utility adjustment/replace ment works. Typically the additional cost is 10% of the total project cost.</p>

Cardno Benchmark Datasheet	Local Infrastructure	IPART Benchmark Rate	CN Comparison Rate	Exclusions	Site Constraint Factor	Additional Site Constraints
Item No. 1.03	New Collector Road	\$2,575/Lm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site Establishment \$63.50/Lm - PU Investigation \$24/Lm - Excavation & Removal \$42/m2 x 13 = \$546/Lm - Subsoil \$80/Lm x 2 = \$160/Lm - Subbase/base \$67/m2 x 13 = \$871/Lm - Kerb and gutter \$76/Lm x 2 = \$152/Lm - Reinforced concrete footpath \$99/m2 x 3.5 = \$346.50/Lm - Spray seal and asphalt \$31/m2 x 11.1 = \$344.10/Lm - Topsoil and turf \$14/m2 x 4 = \$56/Lm - Street trees \$24/Lm (provisional allowance) - Linemarking and signage \$20/Lm <p>Total \$2,607.10/Lm excl. stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Require more detail on stormwater drainage pipe/pits and how they have been factored into rates/design.</p>	As per Item No. 1.01 Also, excluding lime stabilisation (150mm, 3%).	As per Item No. 1.01 Note: bulk waste recycling approximately \$64/m2 x 13m = \$832/Lm excl. stormwater drainage.	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.04	New Sub-arterial Road	\$3,750/Lm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site Establishment \$63.50/Lm - PU Investigation \$24/Lm - Excavation & Removal \$42/m2 x 14.4 = \$605/Lm - Subsoil \$80/Lm x 2 = \$160/Lm - Subgrade/subbase/base \$67/m2 x 14.4 = \$965/Lm - Kerb and gutter \$76/Lm x 2 = \$152/Lm - Reinforced concrete footpath \$99/m2 x 5 = \$495/Lm - Spray seal \$5/m2 x 12.5 = \$62.50/Lm - Asphalt base \$105 x 12.5 = \$1,313/Lm - 50mm AC10 asphalt \$26/m2 x 12.5 = \$325/Lm - Topsoil and turf \$14/m2 x 5 = \$70/Lm 	As per Item No. 1.01 Also, excluding lime stabilisation (150mm, 3%).	As per Item No. 1.01 Note: bulk waste recycling approximately \$90/m2 x 14.4m = \$1,296/Lm excl. stormwater drainage.	As per Item No. 1.01

Cardno Benchmark Datasheet	Local Infrastructure	IPART Benchmark Rate	CN Comparison Rate	Exclusions	Site Constraint Factor	Additional Site Constraints
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Street trees \$24/Lm (provisional allowance) - Linemarking and signage \$20/Lm <p>Total <u>\$4,279/Lm</u> excl. stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Require more detail on stormwater drainage pipe/pits and how they have been factored into rates/design.</p>			
Item No. 1.05	New Industrial Road	\$2,650/Lm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site Establishment \$63.50/Lm - PU Investigation \$24/Lm - Excavation & Removal \$42/m2 x 12 = \$504/Lm - Subsoil \$80/Lm x 2 = \$160/Lm - Subbase/base \$67/m2 x 12 = \$965/Lm - Kerb and gutter \$76/Lm x 2 = \$152/Lm - Spray seal \$5/m2 x 10.1 = \$50.50/Lm - 50mm AC10 asphalt \$26/m2 x 10.1 = \$262.60/Lm - Topsoil and turf \$14/m2 x 6 = \$84/Lm - Street trees \$24/Lm (provisional allowance) - Linemarking and signage \$20/Lm <p>Total <u>\$2,309.60/Lm</u> excl. stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Require more detail on stormwater drainage pipe/pits and how they have been factored into rates/design.</p>	As per Item No. 1.01	As per Item No. 1.01 Note: bulk waste recycling approximately \$64/m2 x 12m = \$768/Lm excl. stormwater drainage.	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.06	New Rural Road	\$2,000/Lm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site Establishment \$63.50/Lm - PU Investigation \$24/Lm - Excavation & Removal \$42/m2 x 10 = \$420/Lm - Subbase/base \$67/m2 x 10 = \$670/Lm - Double spray seal \$10/m2 x 10 = \$100/Lm 	As per Item No. 1.01 Also, excluding K&G, footpath and stormwater drainage.	As per Item No. 1.01 Note: bulk waste recycling approximately \$59/m2 x 10m = \$590/Lm	As per Item No. 1.01

Cardno Benchmark Datasheet	Local Infrastructure	IPART Benchmark Rate	CN Comparison Rate	Exclusions	Site Constraint Factor	Additional Site Constraints
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Topsoil and turf \$14/m² x 1 = \$14/Lm - Linemarking and signage \$20/Lm - Swale drain \$31 x 1.8 = \$55.8/Lm - Hydro mulching \$4/Lm (rate TBC) <p>Total <u>\$1,371.30/Lm</u></p>			
Item No. 1.07	Upgrade to Collector Road	\$3,000/Lm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site Establishment \$39/Lm - PU Investigation \$12/Lm - Excavation & Removal \$42/m² x 3.2 = \$134.4/Lm - Subsoil \$80/Lm x 1 = \$80/Lm - Base (4% stabilised) \$40/m² x 3.2 = \$965/Lm - Kerb and gutter \$76/Lm x 1 = \$76/Lm - Reinforced concrete footpath \$99/m² x 2.5 = \$247.50/Lm - Spray seal \$5/m² x 3.2 = \$16/Lm - Asphalt base \$132 x 3.2 = \$422.40/Lm 50mm AC10 (A15E) asphalt \$31/m² x 3.2 = \$99.20/Lm - Topsoil and turf \$14/m² x 0.5 = \$7/Lm - Linemarking and signage \$10/Lm <p>Total <u>\$2,108.50/Lm</u> excl. stormwater drainage.</p> <p>Require more detail on stormwater drainage pipe/pits and how they have been factored into rates/design.</p>	As per Item No. 1.01 Also, no allowance for street trees.	As per Item No. 1.01 Bulk waste disposal rate not confirmed	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.08	Upgrade to Sub-arterial Road	\$4,200/Lm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site Establishment \$39/Lm - PU Investigation \$12/Lm - Excavation & Removal \$42/m² x 3.2 = \$/Lm - Subsoil \$80/Lm x 1 = \$80/Lm - Subgrade/Subbase/base \$67/m² x = \$/Lm - Kerb and gutter \$76/Lm x 1 = \$/Lm 	As per Item No. 1.01 Also, excluding lime stabilisation (150mm, 3%).	As per Item No. 1.01 Bulk waste disposal rate not confirmed	As per Item No. 1.01

Cardno Benchmark Datasheet	Local Infrastructure	IPART Benchmark Rate	CN Comparison Rate	Exclusions	Site Constraint Factor	Additional Site Constraints
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reinforced concrete footpath \$99/m² x 2.5 = \$346.50/Lm - Spray seal and asphalt \$31/m² x 11.1 = \$344.10/Lm - Topsoil and turf \$14/m² x 4 = \$56/Lm - Street trees \$24/Lm (provisional allowance) - Linemarking and signage \$20/Lm <p>Total \$2,607.10/Lm excl. stormwater drainage. Require more detail on stormwater drainage pipe/pits and how they have been factored into rates/design.</p>			
Item No. 1.09	Signalised Intersection (single lane)	T Intersection \$250,000 4 Way Intersection \$300,000	No CN comparison rate.	Raw material resource factor Cultural heritage Soil condition On-costs 12-22% Planning 20% Design 15% Also, excluding asphalt works.	Typically CN <i>New Local Road</i> sites are Moderately to Highly Constrained and require 20-40% markup to cover traffic control, minor public utility adjustments and bulk waste recycling.	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.10	Signalised Intersection (2 lane)	T Intersection \$325,000 4 Way Intersection \$430,000	No CN comparison rate.	As per Item No. 1.09 Also, excluding asphalt works.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.11	Signalised Intersection and 1 Turning Lane	\$550,000	No CN comparison rate.	As per Item No. 1.09 Also, excluding asphalt works.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01

Cardno Benchmark Datasheet	Local Infrastructure	IPART Benchmark Rate	CN Comparison Rate	Exclusions	Site Constraint Factor	Additional Site Constraints
Item No. 1.13	Priority Controlled/Un-signalised Intersection	T Intersection \$4,200 4 Way Intersection \$6,600	Signs and line-marking only. Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.14	Roundabout Single Lane	\$42,000	Cardno benchmark rate generally aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09 Also, excluding asphalt works.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.16	Concrete Pathway	\$150/m2	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09 Also, exclude turf/topsoil.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.19	Road Bridge (including over railways, waterways)	Road bridge over road/water \$4,000 Road bridge over rail \$6,000	Cardno benchmark rates reflect current CN rates.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.20	Cycleway Bridge	Pedestrian bridge \$10,000 Cycleway bridge \$8,000	Typical CN bridge is approx. \$4,000/m2 (unlikely to construct a pedestrian/cycle bridge over a road or rail).	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.23	Bus Shelter	\$30,000	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 1.25	Pedestrian Crossing	\$13,000	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09 Also, no allowance for asphalt works (raised threshold) and street lighting.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01

Cardno Benchmark Datasheet	Local Infrastructure	IPART Benchmark Rate	CN Comparison Rate	Exclusions	Site Constraint Factor	Additional Site Constraints
Item No. 1.27	Street Lighting	\$12,600		As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.01	Culvert	Single 300x225 \$550/Lm Single 600x450 \$1,100/Lm Single 1500x600 \$1,900/Lm Single 2100x2100 \$4,100/Lm Twin 300x225 \$950/Lm Twin 600x450 \$2,100/Lm Twin 1500x600 \$5,100/Lm Twin 2100x2100 \$7,500/Lm	Cardno benchmark rates seem to align with current CN rates.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.02	Combined Basin and Raingarden Facility	\$270/m2	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.03	Single Raingarden Facility	\$5,200	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.04	Bio-retention basin	Grassed Swale 1.5m \$130/Lm Grassed Swale 3m \$250/Lm Grassed Swale 5m \$330/Lm Bio Retention Trench \$580/Lm Bio Retention Basin \$220/m2	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.05	Bio-retention Filter - Maintenance	\$65/m2	Cardno benchmark rate generally aligns with CN rate but will only support standard material.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01

Cardno Benchmark Datasheet	Local Infrastructure	IPART Benchmark Rate	CN Comparison Rate	Exclusions	Site Constraint Factor	Additional Site Constraints
Item No. 2.08	Wetland Basin	\$130/m2	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.10	Detention Basin	350m2 footprint 1m depth \$200/m2 100m2 footprint 1m depth \$280/m2	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.11	Gross Pollutant Trap	Outlet 450mm dia \$35,000 Outlet 750mm dia \$65,000 Outlet 1200mm dia \$150,000	Cardno benchmark rate generally aligns with CN rate however depends on specifications of product required, quality and amenity being sought. Traps have generally exceeded this amount.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.13	Stormwater Pipe	375mm RCP \$180/Lm 450mm RCP \$200/Lm 600mm RCP \$250/Lm 750mm RCP \$350/Lm 900mm RCP \$450/Lm 1350mm RCP \$750/Lm 1500mm RCP \$950/Lm	Cardno benchmark rates are low. In infill areas generally a maximum of 10Lm per day is laid. Rates vary considerably based on a quantity laid per day.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.14	Stormwater Headwalls	Headwall to suit 375mm RCP \$675 Headwall to suit 525mm RCP \$975 Headwall to suit 750mm RCP \$1,720 Headwall to suit 900mm RCP \$2,000 Headwall to suit 1200mm RCP \$3,650 Headwall to suit 1350mm RCP \$4,675	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01

Cardno Benchmark Datasheet	Local Infrastructure	IPART Benchmark Rate	CN Comparison Rate	Exclusions	Site Constraint Factor	Additional Site Constraints
Item No. 2.15	Stormwater Pits	Precast pit to suit 375mm RCP \$3,500 Precast pit to suit 450mm RCP \$3,500 Precast pit to suit 600mm RCP \$3,850 Precast pit to suit 900mm RCP \$4,800 Precast pit to suit 1050mm RCP \$5,800 Precast pit to suit 1200mm RCP \$6,800	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.16	Stormwater Channel/Open Channel	\$920/Lm	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 2.17	Stormwater Channel Stabilisation	\$1,600/Lm	Cardno benchmark rate aligns with current CN rate.	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01
Item No. 4.15	Park Lighting	\$1,500	\$6,000	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.09	As per Item No. 1.01

ATTACHMENT B

"SUBJECT: NOM 24/08/21 - INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS BILL

RESOLVED: (Councillors Clausen/Mackenzie)

That Council:

1. *Joins numerous other local Councils in calling on the NSW Government to withdraw the Environmental Planning and Assessment Amendment (Infrastructure Contributions) Bill 2021 (the Bill) from the NSW Parliament.*
2. *Calls on the NSW Government to undertake further consultation with the local government sector on any proposed reforms to the infrastructure contributions system.*
3. *Calls on the NSW Government to de-couple the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal led review on population growth from the infrastructure contributions reforms.*
4. *Notes that the NSW Legislative Council's Portfolio Committee 7 recommended that: "the Bill not proceed, until the draft regulations have been developed and release for consultation and the reviews into the rate pegging system, benchmarking and the essential works list have been published by the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal".*
5. *Affirms its support to LGNSW and requests LGNSW continue advocating on our behalf to protect local government from any amendments to infrastructure contributions which leaves councils and communities exposed to expending ratepayer funds on new infrastructure made necessary by new development that is currently the responsibility of developers."*