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1 Introduction

The Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) and councils welcome the opportunity to make a submission to the Parliamentary Inquiry on Growing the Suburbs: Infrastructure and Business Development in Outer Suburban Melbourne. (the Inquiry)

The MAV is the statutory peak body for local government in Victoria. This submission is part of our ongoing commitment to support the various roles of local government that contribute towards the infrastructure and economic development needs of growing suburbs.

Councillors’ roles include a Local Government Authority, a Responsible Planning Authority, a Road Management Authority, as well as various roles as public land, asset and facilities manager, infrastructure provider, and in delivery of civic and community services.

The MAV has responded to three of the items listed in the Inquiry terms of reference:

- identify existing public and private infrastructure provision, including schools, hospitals, commercial and shopping precincts, transport and roads, telecommunications, water and power
- assess the capacity of existing infrastructure to accommodate increased population growth
- examine the role of small businesses, local councils and community groups (such as Rotary and Lions clubs) in developing local expertise.

The Inquiry will necessarily focus on the State Government and development industry’s role in infrastructure provision for critical utility, transport, education and health services. The MAV submission will not directly address issues that are the exclusive responsibility of other levels of government, rather it will focus on council’s statutory responsibilities to provide local infrastructure such as local roads, drainage and streetscape works; council’s provision of community assets such as open space and community facilities, including libraries, kindergartens and childcare centres, and council’s planning functions which underpin the provision of infrastructure.

Collectively, councils manage $47.7 billion worth of assets including roads, bridges, drains, town halls, recreation and leisure facilities, community service facilities, libraries and parks.

The construction, maintenance and upgrade of council infrastructure is necessary for economic development and the provision of welfare and community services, environment services and general public services demanded by communities and on which councils spend over $5 billion annually. Council infrastructure is a substantial in-kind contribution to support delivery of many State Government core services including education and health.

Businesses, as is labour, are naturally drawn to areas which are well served by government infrastructure and community services.

There exists an increasing inequality across metropolitan Melbourne compounded by historical underinvestment in infrastructure and the predominant low density built form.

It is critical that infrastructure be improved and augmented in line with population growth in Melbourne’s growth areas; however suburbs established over the past decade or two also remain a priority, due to ageing infrastructure and levels of service provision in these areas often failing to meet contemporary expectations.
2 Recommendations

**Recommendation 1**: Improve the transparency and certainty of State infrastructure forward planning for growing suburbs, including when and where the GAIC contributions are used.

**Recommendation 2**: Major developments should also contribute to non-road-based public transport infrastructure and services.

**Recommendation 3**: Remove the distinction between community infrastructure and development infrastructure to reduce the under-supply in growing suburbs.

**Recommendation 4**: Review the $900 per household cap on contributions towards community infrastructure to enable full cost recovery for community infrastructure necessitated by population growth.

**Recommendation 5**: The Inquiry should note the low level of developer contributions in Victoria, relative to other major Australian cities.

**Recommendation 6**: Provide greater flexibility for councils to raise funds in established areas, such as by increasing the amount and broadening the application of open space contributions under the *Subdivisions Act*.

**Recommendation 7**: Enable State Government land in excess of requirements to be gifted to councils where other community needs can be demonstrated.

**Recommendation 8**: Create a statutory obligation for a funded and long term State Infrastructure Plan to underpin the infrastructure and business development needs of Victoria’s growing suburbs.
3 Discussion

3.1 Identify existing public and private infrastructure provision, including schools, hospitals, commercial and shopping precincts, transport and roads, telecommunications, water and power

Role of Developer Contribution Plans to identify and deliver infrastructure

Responsibility for the planning, funding and delivery of public and private infrastructure is a responsibility shared across all levels of government, the development industry, private sector and private individuals.

Developer contributions are a necessary component of the funding and provision of basic local community and other infrastructure. Local Government’s ability to raise revenue to assist with funding infrastructure is very limited by comparison to revenue streams available to other levels of Government.

The capacity of councils to raise money for urban infrastructure is often further limited through borrowing restrictions and rate capping.

Good quality, well located and timely community infrastructure results in lower costs of living for residents in emerging communities and reduces the longer term negative social and economic impacts of delayed or under provision. Assertions that councils (and governments) are seeking to transfer responsibility for the provision of community facilities to the private sector, thus affecting affordability are misguided.

Community expectations of the standard of services to be provided is increasing at a time when the amount of financial assistance available from other levels of Government is decreasing – at odds with the rate of development activity.

Development contributions have been widely used in Australia and overseas to fund infrastructure associated with the development of land driven by population growth. This places greater pressure on existing infrastructure and services, and in greenfield locations creates new demand for infrastructure and services that must be established and for which communities are less prepared to wait.

In Victoria contributions are raised in a number of ways including through open space contributions, developer contributions as a result of a Developer contributions plan, conditions on permits, voluntary agreements and municipal or special charges and can be made in cash or in kind.

Since the early 1980s, the range of infrastructure subject to contributions has expanded to include major headwork infrastructure (arterial roads, pumping stations), and social infrastructure (parks, libraries, affordable housing).

Development Contribution Plans (DCPs) are the key mechanism used by councils in ‘growing suburbs’. The process to develop and incorporate a DCP into a local planning scheme is complex, costly and time consuming and is currently being reviewed by DCPD. The Committee is encouraged to access those reports and submissions.

The current DCP process in Victoria is relatively recent, and legislation introduced in 1995 to standardise the way councils charge development contributions proved unworkable and was reviewed in 1999. That review led to reforms in 2002, implemented in 2004 through the Planning and Environment (Development Contributions) Bill 2004, and these changes:

- increased the Community Infrastructure Levy cap to $900 per dwelling
enabled State agencies to collect and administer development contribution levies
simplified preparation of DCPs using a schedule of levies to be set under a Ministerial Direction
clarified the use of planning permit conditions for the provision of, or payment for, works, services or facilities necessitated by a development proposal

The introduction of the Growth Areas Infrastructure Charge by the Growth Areas Authority flowed from these changes. Although the up to $98,000 per hectare charge, contributes to State infrastructure generally identified in a DCP, it is not required to be spent in that area and may be largely deferred. This reduces confidence in the timing and delivery of state infrastructure and services.

Local government does not have this discretion. Consideration should be given to mechanisms to improve the clarity of the planning for and delivery of State infrastructure and services through implementation of a DCP.

*What infrastructure items should be included and funded in a DCP?*

The main categories of assets are: Community facilities; Open space facilities; Transport and Drainage.

A DCP would generally include and provide for developer contributions towards:
- arterial road networks, including acquisition of land and construction associated with the road networks; traffic management works and land
- passive public open space of a local or district nature, including acquisition of land, improvement works to the open space other than basic improvements and works to manage any conservation values of the open space
- local active recreation facilities including acquisition of land and construction of sporting facilities (e.g. sports grounds, tennis courts, pavilions, indoor recreation centres)
- pedestrian and cycle trails along a council arterial road, or within district open space or along major linear open space, including acquisition of land and construction
- local community facilities such as libraries, youth facilities and multi-purpose community centres (which may include meeting rooms, maternal child and health centre and early childhood centre).

As well, a range of assets are provided by developers generally at the subdivision stage which include:
- provision of water, sewerage, energy, telecommunications infrastructure (head works charges)
- land and construction relating to local streets, including lighting, landscaping and footpaths
- local subdivision drainage and flood mitigation works such as retarding basins
- provision of local open space and basic improvements (earthworks, basic landscaping, paths, water tapping) and conservation works
- bus and tram stops and shelters.

Major developments generally contribute towards the cost of State arterial roads through agreements with Vic Roads. Contributions are generally not required for public transport infrastructure and services, regional open space and State-supported community facilities.
The Subdivision Act 1988 requires developers to contribute some of their land for use as local open space which although treated under a different process should remain.

Contributions towards community infrastructure are payable per dwelling when completed, and are currently capped at $900. The distinction between community infrastructure and development infrastructure is artificial and the cap has led to serious under funding and consequential impacts on the supply of community support infrastructure in growing suburbs.

Growth area councils (Melton, Whittlesea, Wyndham, Hume, Casey and Cardinia) have assisted the Growth Areas Authority over past years to develop and refine a list of infrastructure and open space items, which are being discussed in the current DCP review. The draft list is attached at appendix 1, but is not agreed to by councils.

Despite these efforts the draft list provides guidance only and is not ‘fit for purpose’ for even this small group of ‘like’ councils. Fundamental differences exist within and between municipal areas related to proximity (what existing services and infrastructure can also service a growing suburb), access (what transport options easily enable access to more remote services and infrastructure) and history (do existing infrastructure and services exist with excess capacity). A one size fits all approach is not possible for such areas.

As the up-front capital cost is a small proportion of total costs over an assets life, local government believes that a DCP should provide for the full recovery of costs for any local facility or infrastructure wholly required as a consequence of growth. The considerable recurrent costs of operating and maintaining these facilities and infrastructure will be met by rate revenue. Equally, where demand is created by new growth requiring augmentation of local infrastructure this too should be funded through a DCP.

In the past, framework plans and structure plans were developed by councils with varying degrees of State agency input. Today the State Growth Area Authority is producing framework or corridor plans. While it is understandable that the previous council generated plans could not commit the State to fund future state infrastructure needs, it is somewhat incongruous that the State commitment is still absent.

Given the GAIC contributions, the GAA role, and the clear timing and funding commitments made by councils and developers through PSPs and DCPs, it is timely to consider mechanisms to improve the forward planning and certainty for State infrastructure. This however should not be to the detriment of established areas with significant infrastructure and service deficits.

What level of developer contribution is appropriate?

In 2011 The Australian Government Productivity Commission report Performance Benchmarking of Australian Business Regulation: Planning, Zoning and Development Assessments revealed that Victoria has very low developer contribution rates, relative to other Australian cities, particularly for infill development (see figure 1).

In 2009-10, New South Wales had the highest residential infrastructure charges of $37,000 per greenfield lot on average, with charges rising significantly in Queensland over five years to about $27,000 per greenfield lot. South Australia charges cover the narrowest range of infrastructure items and are lowest nationally of about $3,693 per greenfield lot.

The report offers the following explanation for this:
“Sydney has pursued a full cost recovery approach to infrastructure charges (applied to a wider range of infrastructure items including major roads, rail and social and recreational infrastructure) and this resulted in much higher charges ($15,000 per dwelling) than Adelaide ($5,577), Perth ($5,000) and, especially Melbourne ($1,609).” (p 212)

Charges for commercial and industrial land are also highest in New South Wales ($550,000 per hectare) and Queensland ($340,000 per hectare) with the lowest charges in Victoria at $175,000 per hectare.


Other ways to improve the timely identification and delivery of infrastructure in growing suburbs

In growth areas, or growing suburbs, the most common approach is for contributions based on the preparation of a Development Contribution Plan (DCP) under the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

This equates to an up-front user charge for future infrastructure services, equal to the benefit, when a nexus is established between the development, the infrastructure and the contribution required. Without this nexus, they are more akin to a tax.

They require an amendment to a council’s planning scheme and transaction costs are generally high.

The current review by DPCD may lead to more efficient processes to put in place a DCP, however other considerations are important and which may be outside of the scope of that review. They include:
• the need for detailed and spatially resolved land use plans, supplemented by infrastructure specific planning. Good examples of this are the Queensland Infrastructure Plan and some of their regional plans.

• delivery of State infrastructure must be supported by a long-term (5 year) funding commitment through the state budget process.

• designation of responsibility and authority to coordinate infrastructure delivery in new development areas, across public and private providers.

• Indexing of all developer contributions and infrastructure charges

• power to direct or otherwise bind infrastructure providers, including the State to deliver essential infrastructure identified through a PSP and DCP

• consideration and recognition of ongoing service delivery costs associated with infrastructure and open space provision

• the need for a clear policy basis to determine what infrastructure developers should contribute to their developments, what level of charges should be borne by the private sector and what infrastructure government should provide.

• The need for greater consistency in type and quantum of developer contribution.

Recommendation 1: Improve the transparency and certainty of State infrastructure forward planning for growing suburbs, including when and where the GAIC contributions are used.

Recommendation 2: Major developments should also contribute to non-road-based public transport infrastructure and services.

Recommendation 3: Remove the distinction between community infrastructure and development infrastructure to reduce the under-supply in growing suburbs.

Recommendation 4: Review the $900 per household cap on contributions towards community infrastructure to enable full cost recovery for community infrastructure necessitated by population growth.

Recommendation 5: The Inquiry should note the low level of developer contributions in Victoria, relative to other major Australian cities.

3.2 Assess the capacity of existing infrastructure to accommodate increased population growth

Aligning infrastructure investment and making better use of existing infrastructure are key challenges when planning for growth.

In growth areas requiring rezoning and subdivision, the corridor planning and Precinct Structure Planning (PSP) processes, supported by amendments to planning schemes to incorporate a DCP are established processes to identify and collect contributions.

PSPs are master plans for whole communities of up to 30,000 people and designed to ‘create new communities' through laying out roads, shopping centres, schools, parks, housing, employment and connections to transport. Growth Corridor Plans set the strategic direction for future urban development of land within the Urban Growth Boundary and replace the 2006 Growth Area Framework Plans.
For brownfield sites or activity centres, quantifying and demonstrating the net effect on existing services and infrastructure is more difficult, and in addition to open space contributions councils would generally rely on agreements with the developer or conditions on permits.

For dispersed development across established suburbs establishing a clear nexus to justify a DCP is almost impossible. Many established areas proximate to growth areas experience significant demands on their open space and service infrastructure.

The use of DCPs in growth areas can therefore place undue emphasis on greenfield development over urban infill. Melbourne’s established (inner and outer) suburbs also face a range of infrastructure and service delivery challenges associated with maintaining a desirable level of service as infrastructure ages, population grows and community expectations change.

An important task of this inquiry is to investigate options which add value to existing suburbs, not focus exclusively on infrastructure provision in greenfield developments, but that make better use of existing infrastructure.

However there are circumstances where established areas suffer ‘infrastructure deficits’ due to their ageing infrastructure, especially in the inner and middle suburbs, and for some outer suburbs, created late last century where the provision of infrastructure and services was inadequate.

The MAV has worked with the Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD) Housing Growth Requirements project to better understand local demands for housing and the capacity to meet this demand for the 31 metropolitan councils. Capacity took into account planning policy settings and controls, market trends and, to some extent, infrastructure capacity. During our engagement with councils we found concerns about increasing density in areas with old infrastructure and insufficient services, the impact of development in growth areas on established suburbs, recognition of the need to balance growth with adequate infrastructure provision, public transport services and public open space and the challenges of high growth in established areas.

The MAV understands that during the Housing Growth Requirements Project DPCD compiled information about infrastructure in existing suburbs which may be available to the committee although the data and outcomes of the project are yet to be finalised for release to councils.

This submission will focus on the effects of increasing population on council owned and maintained community facilities, from which services are delivered and transport infrastructure which provides access.

Community infrastructure

Community infrastructure generally refers to children’s and family services facilities, indoor and outdoor sport and recreation facilities, libraries, passive open space and general facilities such as neighbourhood houses and meeting spaces.

Victorian councils manage $47.7 billion worth of assets and infrastructure including roads, bridges, town halls, recreation and leisure facilities, community service facilities, drains, libraries and parks.
The construction, maintenance and upgrade of council infrastructure is critical to the provision of welfare and community services, environment services and general public services which are demanded by communities and on which councils spend over $5 billion annually. Council infrastructure is also a substantial in-kind contribution to the efficient and effective delivery of many State Government core services including education and health. In particular, many State and Federal Government services are delivered in council-owned and maintained buildings.

Councils’ utilise specific methods to identify community infrastructure requirements necessary to deliver the level of services demanded by their community. Although these methods vary, at their core, they utilise demographic information and service provision ratios (quantity of services per person/household) to estimate infrastructure and ongoing service delivery requirements.

As previously stated the up-front capital cost relative to the ongoing maintenance, renewal and service delivery costs over the asset life is small, should be funded fully through a development contribution and not through rates.

In 2008 growth area councils contributed to a report Planning for Community Infrastructure in Growth Suburbs which offers a thorough explanation and justification of community service provision ratios, a selection of which are provided in figure 2.

Figure 2: A selection of community service infrastructure provision ratios (figures have been approximated and simplified).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Approximate Desired Provision Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Bowls Club</td>
<td>1 club per 40000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 passive space</td>
<td>0.7 to 1 ha per 1000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>1 Council Aquatic Centre per 40 to 50000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Old Kindergarten</td>
<td>Capacity to accommodate 100% of four year olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor netball facilities</td>
<td>1 court per 3500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal &amp; Child Health Service</td>
<td>1 dual M&amp;CH facility per 16000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child playgroup</td>
<td>1 per 5000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1 per 30000 to 60000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council community centre</td>
<td>1 per 8000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ha sports ground</td>
<td>1 per 1000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 ha sports ground</td>
<td>1 per 2 to 3000 households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These provision ratios are based on a range of factors, including:
- Requirements to meet Federal of State Government policy
- Future demand modelling based on demographic change
- Existing usage in nearby areas
- Outcomes of municipal-wide strategies for service delivery

Recent greenfield developments in many municipalities have planned for, and subject to funding, will deliver community infrastructure generally in line with these ratios – resulting in relatively well-serviced communities.

However, many established outer suburbs do not enjoy this level of service provision currently. Without a funding stream to address this shortfall, additional population growth may exacerbate this situation.
State Government population forecasts, such as the 2008 Victoria in Future estimate that 316,000 new dwellings will be added to Melbourne’s established areas between 2006 and 2026. Under this scenario (assuming a multiplier of three people per household), in order to maintain desirable levels of service provision, additional community facilities would be required being:: 100 4-5 ha sports grounds; 60 Maternal and Child Health facilities’ 24 lawn bowls clubs, 19 aquatic centres among others. Accessing the necessary land and providing infrastructure at this rate will not be possible under current policy frameworks.

Councils in established areas are constrained in accessing appropriately sized parcels of land and open space contributions are generally made in cash at a reduced rate. Some councils have established reserve funds for the purchase of land should a suitable site become available. However, in most cases the capital required for major land purchase is beyond council means.

Councils have consistently called for State Government land, found to be in excess of their requirements, to be made available at no or low cost to councils for another community purpose.

Established suburbs will be affected differently by increasing population and demographic change due to their location and past infrastructure investment. Figure 3 demonstrates significant population growth predicted in most municipal areas. Using municipal areas as a basis for comparison is simplistic. Within municipalities, many suburbs have historical underinvestment in infrastructure, poor access to transport choices, schools, quality open space, recreation and to employment. Without a source funding or land for new infrastructure, these areas can expect a further decline in service delivery standards.

**Figure 3**: Projected population growth: Melbourne Local Government Areas 2006-2026. Source: DPCD Housing Growth Requirements Project – April 2009 Fact Sheet.

The Inquiry should note models for improved infrastructure planning and delivery in other states, such as the Queensland Infrastructure Plan (QIP), a twenty year strategy linking infrastructure delivery, population growth and economic development priorities. Important features include:

- integration of state infrastructure plans with regional infrastructure plans
• alignment of infrastructure plans with population growth and economic development strategies
• State and local government cooperation.

**Recommendation 6:** Provide greater flexibility for councils to raise funds in established areas, such as by increasing the amount and broadening the application of open space contributions under the Subdivisions Act.

**Recommendation 7:** Enable State Government land in excess of requirements to be gifted to councils where other community needs can be demonstrated.

---

**Transport**

There is a strong link between community wellbeing and the presence of transport infrastructure which allows access to employment, recreation and community services. Sustained under-investment in public transport infrastructure over many decades has created unequal access to employment, recreation and community services across metropolitan Melbourne.

Of most importance is access to employment. The Australian Bureau of Statistics *Melbourne Social Atlas 2006* demonstrates that jobs and services tend to cluster along main rail lines.

It is well known that residents of poorly serviced suburbs have higher levels of car ownership and travel greater distances by private car. The Department of Transport’s VISTA data reveals that residents of middle and outer ring suburbs overwhelmingly rely on private vehicles to travel. There is a critical deficiency in transport infrastructure, other than roads, in many growing suburbs, which restricts those areas capacity to attract and accommodate increased population growth, employers and service providers.

Councils seeking to co-locate new community facilities with transport infrastructure require more confidence and certainty about State Government transport infrastructure forward-planning than is currently available. The 2011 MAV State Council resolved that:

> "whilst acknowledging the Victorian Government has initiated major rail project studies… and has committed to significant investment in other rail infrastructure… the State Government [must] provide its blueprint for public transport improvements and its timeline for implementation of these improvements within its current term"

Councils have a statutory requirement to develop and implement five year forward plans for their capital and maintenance investment in civic infrastructure, parks and gardens, recreation, community and early-years facilities. This provides for transparent decision making processes and builds confidence about delivery.

There is currently no State-based planning process which identifies transport infrastructure requirements concurrent with population growth and establishes a pathway for its delivery.
The draft Growth Corridor Plans include transit oriented development objectives as well as identifying areas for service by rapid bus or new train stations. In the City of Hume alone, the two Corridor Plans identify over $1billion each of State Infrastructure requirements that are neither funded nor committed, and lack a defined revenue stream to ensure they will be delivered.

Proximity to transport, greater co-location of services into ‘community hubs’ and use of council open space to support State government schools open space needs all heighten the importance of coordination of local and state infrastructure plans. Growing suburbs often have very high numbers of birth notifications but can also have high numbers of retirees. Over 65s in Wyndham are the fastest growing cohort as large scale retirement villages are developed, placing significant future demand on Home and Community Care and health services.

**Recommendation 8:** Create a statutory obligation for a funded and long term State Infrastructure Plan to underpin the infrastructure and business development needs of Victoria’s growing suburbs.

### 3.3 Examine the role of small business, local councils and community groups in developing local expertise

Councils have limited capacity to significantly influence business activity unless they work cooperatively and collaborate. This can be done regionally, at a sectoral level, and with other levels of government.

Many councils work actively through local traders, markets and main street programs. Some councils support business and encourage the development of local expertise by promoting industrial clusters, supporting development of mixed use precincts and providing supporting infrastructure, marketing and other supports.

Examples include the *Western Region Employment and Industrial Development Strategy* and the *South East Melbourne Innovation Precinct* (SEMIP) where councils partner to develop major land use projects, transport infrastructure and ensure appropriate commercial and industrial land release.

It is critical that the State Government proactively plan for and coordinate activities to ensure long term economic prosperity for Victorians and that this work inform and underpin municipal and activity centre based planning.
### Appendix 1

#### Possible list of infrastructure for inclusion in a Developer Contribution Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community/Civic Facilities</th>
<th>DIRECT</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Level 1 Multi-Purpose Community Centre - Land</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level 1 Multi-Purpose Community Centre - Construction</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level 2 Community Centre - Land (incl. in Level 1 Centre)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level 2 Community Centre - Construction</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level 3 Specialist Community Centre - Land (incl. in Level 1 Centre)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Level 3 Specialist Community Centre - Construction</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Civic Centre - main office - Land</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Civic Centre - main office - Construction</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Civic Centre - branch office - Land</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Civic centre - branch office - Construction</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Municipal Library - Land</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Municipal Library - Construction</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Regional Arts Centre - Land</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Regional Arts Centre - Construction</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Early childhood (pre-school) - Land (incl. in Community Centre)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Early childhood (pre-school) - Construction (incl. in Community Centre)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional Information:
- **Precedents of Practice**:
  - 17. Conservation Reserve (Small Scale) - Land | ✔️ |
  - 19. Conservation Reserve (Small Scale) - Construction | ✔️ |
  - 20. Local Public Park Construction (Fireworks, Parks, Trails, Playing Fields, Trees) | ✔️ |
  - 22. Town Square, Village Greens in NAC or MAC - Land | ✔️ |
  - 24. Estate Fairfield (West), Arts, Exhibits, Building Elements, Additional Paving, Custom Furniture, including parks which are not accredited | ✔️ |
  - 25. Landscaping and Significant Advanced Trees | ✔️ |
  - 26. Playground, Local, Distinct or Regional - Land | ✔️ |
  - 27. Playground, Local - Construction | ✔️ |
  - 28. Playground, District or Regional - Construction | ✔️ |
  - 29. Indoor Recreation Centre (100% Self-funded or with State Secondary College) | ✔️ |
  - 30. Indoor Recreation Centre - Construction | ✔️ |
  - 31. Land required for Major Regional Sports (Aquatic Centre including Gymnasium) | ✔️ |
  - 32. Major Facilities (Aquatic Centre including Gymnasium) - Construction | ✔️ |
  - 33. Land required for localised/alled indoor recreation | ✔️ |
  - 34. Construction of localised/alled indoor recreation facility | ✔️ |
  - 35. Construction of playground to support recreation facilities | ✔️ |
  - 36. Artistic Lake (with no drainage function) | ✔️ |

#### Drainage:
- 51. Local Estate Drainage | ✔️ |
- 52. Major Drainage Path / Channel - Land | ✔️ |
- 53. Major Drainage Path / Channel - Construction | ✔️ |

#### Transport / Infrastructure:
- 40. Path / Bike Path / Shared Trail within or Outside of Existing Development Sites | ✔️ |
- 41. Recreational Bike Path / Missing Links | ✔️ |
- 42. Connector Road Access/Local Roads - Land and Construction | ✔️ |
- 43. Artificial Road, Council (mm. 4 lanes) - Land | ✔️ |
- 44. Artificial Road, Council (mm. 4 lanes) - Construction | ✔️ |
- 45. Artificial Road, Council (Future VicRoads) - Land | ✔️ |
- 46. Artificial Road, Council (Future VicRoads) - Construction | ✔️ |
- 47. Artificial Road, Council (Future VicRoads) - 2nd Corrugation Construction | ✔️ |
- 48. Artificial Road, VicRoads - land | ✔️ |
- 49. Artificial Road, VicRoads - construction | ✔️ |
- 50. Artificial Road, VicRoads (within or Outside of Development Sites) | ✔️ |
- 51. Intersection, Connector/Local Road to Connector/Local road | ✔️ |
- 52. Intersection, Connector/Local Road to Council or VicRoads Artificial Road (controlled) | ✔️ |
- 53. Intersection, Connector/Local Road to VicRoads (Artificial Road), Controlled | ✔️ |
- 54. Intersection, Council Articulation | ✔️ |
- 55. Intersection, Council Articulation | ✔️ |
- 56. VicRoads Artificial to VicRoads Artificial | ✔️ |
- 57. Local Road, VicRoads (within or Outside of Development Sites) | ✔️ |
- 58. Local Road, VicRoads (within or Outside of Development Sites) | ✔️ |
- 59. Local Road, VicRoads (within or Outside of Development Sites) | ✔️ |

*Includes: Combination of Precincts, Multi-purpose Community Rooms, Business Accommodation, Education (primary), Education (secondary), Youth Space, Youth Centre, Arts, Cultural Facility
** Includes: Combination of Neighbourhood Houses, Preschool, Kindergarten, Multi-purpose Community Rooms, Business Accommodation, Education (primary), Education (secondary), Youth Space, Youth Centre, Arts, Cultural Facility
*** Includes: Combination of Neighbourhood Houses, Preschool, Kindergarten, Multi-purpose Community Rooms, Business Accommodation, Education (primary), Education (secondary), Youth Space, Youth Centre, Arts, Cultural Facility

*Primary Funding Source
*Secondary Funding Source

---
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