## State code 22: Environmentally relevant activities

Table 22.2.2: Material change of use

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
All ERAs		
PO1 Development is suitably located and designed to avoid or mitigate environmental harm to the acoustic environment.	AO1.1 Development meets the acoustic quality objectives for sensitive receptors identified in the Environmental Protection (Noise) Policy 2019.	Complies with PO1  The report prepared by <i>Acoustics RB Pty Ltd Report No. 21-1249.R01</i> dated April 2021 describes and details the existing and potential impacts on the Noise quality environment associated with the proposed facility. Report outcomes confirm that the proposed facility will be compliant with relevant assessment criteria upper limits at the nearest sensitive receivers. Refer Environmental Noise Assessment for further details.
PO2 Development is suitably located and designed to avoid or mitigate environmental harm to the air environment.	AO2.1 Development meets the air quality objectives of the Environmental Protection (Air) Policy 2019.	Complies with AO2.1  The report prepared by Vipac Engineers and Scientists Ltd (CTP Mossman Sugar Mill Air Quality Assessment) describes and details the existing and potential impacts on the Air quality environment associated with the proposed facility. Report outcomes confirm that air quality objectives can be achieved post-development.
PO3 Development, other than intensive animal industry for poultry farming, is suitably located and designed to avoid or mitigate environmental harm on adjacent sensitive land uses caused by odour.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	Complies with PO3  The report prepared by Vipac Engineers and Scientists Ltd (CTP Mossman Sugar Mill Air Quality Assessment) describes and details the existing and potential impacts on the Air quality environment in relation to odour associated with the proposed facility. Report outcomes confirm that

State Development Assessment Provisions – version 2.6 State code 22: Environmentally relevant activities

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
		potential odour emissions will not impact nearby sensitive receivers post-development.
PO4 Development is suitably located and designed to avoid or mitigate environmental harm to the receiving waters environment.	AO4.1 Development meets the management intent, water quality guidelines and objectives of the Environmental Protection (Water and Wetland Biodiversity) Policy 2019.	Complies with PO4  The proposed facility is located within the FNM grounds and all clean water infrastructure is currently in place. The proposed facility will utilise this infrastructure directing clean water (i.e. where not intercepting potential sources of pollution e.g. clean hardstand, roads) into the existing system which is treated via a Humeceptor GPT prior to release to a holding lagoon that eventually overflows to receiving waters. This system is monitored under ERA licence EPPR00920713 that acknowledges the requirements of the EPP 2019.  Where processes within the facility have potential to contaminate overland flow, bunded areas will allow potentially contaminated water flows and transferred (via pump) to the FNM mill contaminated water system. This system redirects contaminated water back into the milling process as a re-cycle process preventing release to receiving waters. When the FNM mill is not operational, potentially contaminated wastewater will be collected and re-directed as trade waste under agreement with local council.  Given this process, it is considered that compliance with PO4 is achieved.
PO5 Development is designed to include elements which:	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	Complies with PO5
prevent or minimise the production of hazardous contaminants and waste as byproducts; or		The facility process has been designed with respect to the waste management hierarchy that supports the re-use of waste materials including those of a hazardous nature. Examples of this include:

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
contain and treat hazardous contaminants on- site rather than releasing them into the environment; and		<ul> <li>Cooling tower overflow water. Recycle and return to FNM mill process.</li> <li>Pasteurisation cooling water. Recycle and return to</li> </ul>
provide secondary containment to prevent the accidental release of hazardous contaminants to the environment from spillage or leaks.		<ul> <li>FNM mill process.</li> <li>Bagasse, mud and fibres. Reuse in FNM mill process.</li> <li>Cane trash and dirt. Return to cane farmer for field fertilisation.</li> <li>Boiler blowdown water return to process.</li> <li>RO brine water return to process.</li> <li>Process wash water return to process.</li> <li>Off specification product reprocessing.</li> </ul>
		Where re-use opportunities cannot be identified, hazardous liquid wastes will be disposed of under a trade waste agreement with local council or managed under the framework of Environmentally Relevant Activity (ERA) permits issued under the administration of the DES.  Secondary containment will take the form of bunded areas (within areas of the process train that may potentially result in release of polluted or hazardous materials) allowing emergency containment. In this event, (where necessary) the plant will shut down until the point source is identified and
		rectification is complete.  Given the above consideration to the management of waste we consider that compliance with PO5 is achieved.

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
PO6 Environmentally hazardous materials located on site are stored to avoid or minimise their release into the environment due to inundation during flood events.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	Complies with PO6  The proposed footprint of the facility is located outside of the 100Year ARI flood levels determined from review of Mossman flood studies. Additionally, storage of any hazardous materials will be undertaken in accordance with the National Standard for the Storage and Handling of Workplace Dangerous Goods NOHSC:1015 (2001).
All development – matters of environmental significance		
PO7 Development:  1. avoids impacts on matters of state environmental significance; or  2. minimises and mitigates impacts on matters of state environmental significance after demonstrating avoidance is not reasonably possible; and  3. provides an offset if, after demonstrating all reasonable avoidance, minimisation and mitigation measures are undertaken, the development results in an acceptable significant residual impact on a matter of state environmental significance.  Statutory note: For Brisbane core port land, an offset may only be applied to development on land identified as E1 Conservation/Buffer, E2 Open Space or Buffer/Investigation in the Brisbane Port LUP precinct plan. For the Brisbane Port LUP, see <a href="https://www.portbris.com.au">www.portbris.com.au</a> .  Note: Guidance for determining if the development will have a significant residual impact on a matter of state environmental significance is provided in the Significant Residual Impact Guideline, Department of State	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	PO7 – Not relevant. MSES do not occur within the development footprint.

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response	
significant residual impact is considered an acceptable impact on the matter of state environmental significance and an offset is considered appropriate, the offset should be delivered in accordance with the <i>Environmental Offsets Act 2014</i> .			
Category C areas and category R areas of vegetation			
PO8 Development:  1. avoids impacts on category C areas of vegetation and category R areas of vegetation; or  2. minimises and mitigates impacts on category C areas and category R areas of vegetation after demonstrating avoidance is not reasonably possible.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	PO8 – Not relevant Category C and R areas of vegetation do not occur within the development footprint.	
Intensive animal industry – poultry farming (ERA 4(2))			
PO9 Poultry farming development (where farming more than 200,000 birds) is suitably located and designed to avoid or mitigate environmental harm on adjacent sensitive land uses caused by odour.	AO9.1 For poultry farming involving 300,000 birds or less, development meets the separation distances as determined using the S-factor methodology to:  1. a sensitive land use in a rural zone; and 2. boundary of a non-rural zone. OR	PO9.1 – Not relevant	
	<ul> <li>AO9.2 Development meets the separation distances as determined by odour modelling using the following criteria:</li> <li>1. 2.5 odour units, 99.5 percent, 1 hour average for a sensitive land use in a rural zone; or</li> <li>2. 1.0 odour units, 99.5 percent, 1 hour average for the boundary of a non-rural zone.</li> </ul>	PO9.2 – Not relevant	
	Statutory note: Guidance for determining if the development will cause environmental harm caused by odour is provided in the Development of Meat Chicken Farms in Queensland, Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, 2016 and the Guideline – Odour Impact Assessment from Developments, Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, 2013.		