

The proponent is required to provide the Coordinator-General with a response to the information requested below.

The requested additional information seeks to clarify inadequacies in the scope of the proposed development and the impacts of the proposed development.

Responding comprehensively to this request is required to assist in streamlining the assessment process.

No.	Issue	Information Requested
Hazardous substances		
1	State Code 21 – flood risk	In accordance with section 2.5.9 of the Townsville State Development Area (SDA) Development Scheme (SDA wide assessment criteria), development is required to demonstrate consistency with all relevant legislative requirements for the development to proceed and operate. It is necessary to confirm consistency with State Code 21 requirements with regard to flood risk, particularly as it is noted that that within the Flood Impact Assessment, report reference MJ2601-FIA, revision B, prepared by Northern Consulting Engineers (NCE), dated 25 March 2025 (FIA) the “exposed site” defined storm tide level of 4.5m AHD appears to be above most of the site finished ground level of 4.0m to 4.6m. The proponent is requested to: 1. Provide a detailed response to State Code 21 PO10 for flood risk, including, but not limited to, how hazardous chemical storage, and critical systems relating to their safe storage, are affected and/or protected from storm tide inundation. The response should consider to the following: a) How the statements from the FIA (pages 23 and 24) relate to the requirements specified in section 3.7.2.1 of State Code 21 (https://www.worksafe.qld.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0021/19452/planning-guide-state-code-21.pdf): i. <i>Whilst the planning scheme does not nominate freeboard above flood levels in industrial areas, consideration should be given to any critical infrastructure and hazardous storages areas to be located at a suitable freeboard above the nominated event in accordance with SC6.7 flood hazard and / or above the natural ground level. NCE recommend a minimum freeboard of 300mm (above</i>

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		<i>the relevant flood level and above the natural ground level).</i> <i>ii. Additionally, whilst the development is well outside the 100m setback from the shoreline mapped as part of the TCC coastal hazard overlay, the site is in the vicinity of relatively open tidal salt flats at a low level and as such is relatively exposed to storm surge and coastal wave runoff actions. Therefore, consideration should be given to locating any regional fuel storage facilities or other sensitive elements of the development at the higher, exposed site defined storm tide event level of 4.5m AHD.</i>
2	State Code 21 – bushfire risk	In accordance with section 2.5.9 of the Townsville SDA Development Scheme (SDA wide assessment criteria), development is required to demonstrate consistency with all relevant legislative requirements for the development to proceed and operate. It is necessary to confirm consistency with State Code 21 requirements with regard to bushfire risk. Consideration of bushfire hazard in the Planning Report (reference 28011007-HSE-REP-00007, revision 0, dated 17 June 2025, Section 9.6) is generic for an industrial use and does not consider additional risks/hazards relating to the storage and processing of large quantities of flammable liquids. While the development site itself may be cleared of vegetation and bushfire risk, the land immediately south will remain vegetated and will therefore be a bushfire risk to the facility, particularly the risk of flying embers igniting storage tanks or a bushfire emergency requiring site evacuation. The proponent is requested to: 1. Provide a detailed response to State Code 21 PO10 for bushfire risk, including, but not limited to, how hazardous chemical storage, and critical systems relating to their safe storage, are affected and/or protected from bushfire risk. The response must address the bushfire risk to the facility from the vegetated land immediately south of the facility site, particularly the risk of flying embers igniting storage tanks or a bushfire emergency requiring site evacuation.
3	Schedule 15 Chemicals	In accordance with section 2.5.9 of the Townsville SDA Development Scheme (SDA wide assessment criteria), development is required to demonstrate consistency with all relevant legislative requirements for the development to proceed and operate. It is necessary to accurately disclose the quantity of Work Health and Safety Regulation 2011,

No.	Issue	Information Requested																											
		Schedule 15 Chemicals to determine if the major hazard threshold has been exceeded. In addition to the Chemical Storage Plan, Technical Reference Document 2811007-PI-PLA-00001_0, prepared by Jet Zero, dated 15 October 2024 (CSP), Table 1 below, provides a list of other possible Schedule 15 Chemicals that may not have been disclosed because storage/operation at high temperatures means they meet the criteria of Schedule 15 categories with lower thresholds than the same liquids at ambient temperature or contain light ends making them category 1 flammable liquids. <i>Table 1: Quantities of additional Schedule 15 chemicals indicated to be on the facility site, in process equipment.</i> <table> <tr> <th>Description</th><th>Temperature °C</th><th>Volume, m³</th></tr> <tr> <td>Ethanol Pre Treatment Column Reboiler C-1100 (vapour) and Pre Treatment Column Condenser HE-1110</td><td>74</td><td>162</td></tr> <tr> <td>Ethanol Pre Treatment Column Reboiler C-1100 bottom and Side Draw Condenser HE-1103 including Pre Treatment Column Base Bleed Pump P 1120A/B</td><td>100</td><td>3.7</td></tr> <tr> <td>Pre Treatment Side Draw Condenser and Drum, HE 1130 and V-1131</td><td>95</td><td>2.2</td></tr> <tr> <td>Pre Treatment Column Base Pump P-1132A/B and Cation Guard Bed Package Z-1150</td><td>72</td><td>19.5</td></tr> <tr> <td>Vaporiser Feed Drum V-1250 (Vapour) and Feed Vaporiser HE-1251 (shell side) to HE 1330</td><td>153</td><td>22.9</td></tr> <tr> <td>Vaporiser Feed Drum V-1250 (liquid side)</td><td>114</td><td>4.2</td></tr> <tr> <td>Reactor 1 R-1260</td><td>216</td><td>51.5</td></tr> <tr> <td>Reactor R 1270/80/90/1300/1310/1320</td><td>241</td><td>16</td></tr> </table>	Description	Temperature °C	Volume, m ³	Ethanol Pre Treatment Column Reboiler C-1100 (vapour) and Pre Treatment Column Condenser HE-1110	74	162	Ethanol Pre Treatment Column Reboiler C-1100 bottom and Side Draw Condenser HE-1103 including Pre Treatment Column Base Bleed Pump P 1120A/B	100	3.7	Pre Treatment Side Draw Condenser and Drum, HE 1130 and V-1131	95	2.2	Pre Treatment Column Base Pump P-1132A/B and Cation Guard Bed Package Z-1150	72	19.5	Vaporiser Feed Drum V-1250 (Vapour) and Feed Vaporiser HE-1251 (shell side) to HE 1330	153	22.9	Vaporiser Feed Drum V-1250 (liquid side)	114	4.2	Reactor 1 R-1260	216	51.5	Reactor R 1270/80/90/1300/1310/1320	241	16
Description	Temperature °C	Volume, m ³																											
Ethanol Pre Treatment Column Reboiler C-1100 (vapour) and Pre Treatment Column Condenser HE-1110	74	162																											
Ethanol Pre Treatment Column Reboiler C-1100 bottom and Side Draw Condenser HE-1103 including Pre Treatment Column Base Bleed Pump P 1120A/B	100	3.7																											
Pre Treatment Side Draw Condenser and Drum, HE 1130 and V-1131	95	2.2																											
Pre Treatment Column Base Pump P-1132A/B and Cation Guard Bed Package Z-1150	72	19.5																											
Vaporiser Feed Drum V-1250 (Vapour) and Feed Vaporiser HE-1251 (shell side) to HE 1330	153	22.9																											
Vaporiser Feed Drum V-1250 (liquid side)	114	4.2																											
Reactor 1 R-1260	216	51.5																											
Reactor R 1270/80/90/1300/1310/1320	241	16																											

No.	Issue	Information Requested		
		Reactor Product Separator V-1332 (vapour)	135	8.1
		OLIG 1 Reactors R-2130A/B to HE-2100, HE-2200 to V 2210 inlet	145	66.4
		OLIG 2 Reactors R-2350A/B	205	24.5
		Stabiliser Column C-2400 (vap) and Overhead Cooler HE-2411 (shell side)	250	36
		Hydrogenation Reactor R 2460	149	22
		Hydrogenation HP Separator V-2470 (liquid) and R-2460 outlet line	149	14.9
		Fractionator C-2600, Side Draw pump P-2711A/B, Cooler HE-2710 to Jet storage	99	46.4
		V-6100 Olefins Processing Vessels (NNF)	6	909
		The proponent is requested to: 1. Include in the list of Schedule 15 Chemicals contained within the CSP: a) Quantities of <i>liquids that meet the criteria for class 3 packing group I materials</i> – these may be present in process vessels such as fractionators, reactors, overheads drums and condensers. b) Quantities of <i>liquids with flash points <61°C kept above their boiling points at ambient conditions [use initial boiling point for mixtures]</i> - these may be present in process vessels such as fractionators, reactors, overheads drums and condensers. c) Quantities of catalysts and reagents that may be toxic according to Schedule 15.1, Table 15.3 – for example some vanadium-based catalysts. d) All quantities in tonnes, based on the normal liquid operating levels in process vessels and H alarm level for storage tanks. 2. Provide mass balance or material flow diagrams or process flow diagrams or any other document(s) that provide material stream properties including initial boiling point, flash point, vapour pressure, density, composition, temperature, pressure. 3. Provide process area general arrangement drawings showing major plant and vessels and any other documents		

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		listing the liquid volumes contained.
Traffic and transport operations		
4	Route assessment	A route assessment was not included as part of the SDA application. A route assessment is required to demonstrate that the haulage of modular units and construction materials during the construction stage can be undertaken safely, without adversely affecting the state-controlled road network, and that all movements can comply with dimension, load, safety and operating requirements. This is considered a relevant matter for consideration in the SDA application in accordance with section 2.5.6 (transport) and section 2.5.9 (other government matters) of the Townsville SDA Development Scheme. It is acknowledged that Jet Zero has previously provided a route assessment to the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) for review outside of the SDA application assessment process. However, confirmation is required that the route assessment previously submitted to TMR forms part of the SDA application, represents the final haulage methodology, and remains accurate. The proponent is requested to: 1. Provide TMR with confirmation that the previously submitted route assessment represents the final haulage methodology and remains accurate for the current development proposal (include confirmation of the version of the report that is being referenced). Alternatively, the proponent is requested to: 2. Provide an updated route assessment, prepared by a suitably qualified Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland (RPEQ) traffic engineer that includes at a minimum: a) Confirmation of the intended haulage route for oversized over mass load (OSOM) movements to and from the subject site. b) The expected vehicle and component combinations, sizes, masses, and configurations required to access the subject site via the State-controlled Road network.

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		c) Confirmation of the number of expected OSOM movements required to access the subject site via the State-controlled Road network. d) The expected haulage timeframes and commencement periods. e) A swept path analysis of the haulage route to confirm that OSOM components can be safely transported to and from the subject site without impacting upon users of the State transport network. f) Appropriate mitigation measures and/or road upgrades (where required) to safely and efficiently transport OSOM components to the subject site. g) Proposed layover areas, stopping bays, and passing opportunities to be relied upon by the project.
5	Structural impacts to State Transport Infrastructure	In accordance with section 2.5.6 (transport) and section 2.5.9 (other government matters) of the Townsville SDA Development Scheme, it is necessary to ensure the plant components can physically arrive at the Port of Townsville and travel from the port to the development site during the construction stage. TMR has concerns that structures along this route are likely to be impacted by the proposed OSOM. Specifically, the proposed transport route for the heavy components will require the crossing of several of TMR's road structures, which are likely to be impacted by the substantial weight should these components not be further broken down. To date TMR has received and reviewed the following documentation outside of the SDA application: a) Desktop route assessment: The route assessed bypasses Ross River Bridge – barging onto the southern side of the bridge to Southern Port Road. The report indicates that two power lines will need to be buried. There are 9 culverts, and 3 bridges identified - which require structural assessment. One bridge – a fourth, is not listed in the route summary and will also need to be assessed. b) Ross River girder analysis (AECOM): Noting this bridge was not part of the abovementioned route desktop assessment, the report indicates that a self-propelled modular transporter (SPMT) load of 1750 tonnes might be feasible and further structural, geometric, geotechnical assessment would be required. To ensure transport of the OSOM plant equipment across the State-controlled road network does not create unacceptable structural risks or adverse structural impacts to TMR's transport infrastructure, a revised proposal and additional analysis is required to be provided for review. This must include a risk-managed approach that aligns with the recognised hierarchy of controls, being i) Elimination, ii) Elimination/Substitution, iii) Engineering controls. The

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		proponent must demonstrate that the highest order controls (as outlined below) have been thoroughly evaluated and, where reasonable and practicable, adopted. The proponent is requested to: 1. Provide the following information detailing the arrival of the plant equipment into the Port of Townsville, with all engineering components having appropriate RPEQ certification: a) Type of vessel ('mother ship') bringing the cargo. b) Maximum weight of the largest unit if discharging by ship's gear. c) Specifications of the barges (length, beam, draft, including module) if the float is on or float off. d) Proposed transfer point (ramp) offloading facility at the port if the float is off. e) Depth required to submerge and float off the barge(s). f) If considering an alternative offloading facility: i. Location of the facility. ii. Access channel survey results. iii. Specifications of barges and prime mover ('tug'). iv. Simulations for access channel and vessel size/channel width. 2. Provide a revised proposal for transporting the plant equipment to the site during the construction stage, with all engineering components having appropriate RPEQ certification, specifically addressing: a) Consideration of on-site construction/assembly to reduce the requirement for OSOM movements of large components (Elimination). b) Reduction to the smallest practicable indivisible units (Elimination/Substitution). Proponents are required to eliminate or minimise oversized transport loads by breaking components down to the smallest practicable unit. This step must be fully exhausted before any engineered transport solution is proposed. c) Engineering controls apply only after reduction is demonstrated. Structural assessments, swept paths, capacity assessments and other engineering solutions apply only after loads are broken down and still exceed allowable limits. For this step, provide justification that all structures on the route impacted by the transportation of the module are assessed and analysed for Ultimate Limit State (ULS) and Serviceability Limit State (SLS) assessments. This includes all structural elements, connections, and geotechnical

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		capacities, ensuring that all components of the existing structures have adequate ULS and SLS capacity for the proposed loading, taking into consideration the current condition of the bridges and the impact of repeated loadings. TMR's understanding is there are 12 movements. Provide all models, calculations, and reports that are required to justify the assessment, and all engineering components must have appropriate RPEQ certification.
6	Traffic network impacts	TMR has undertaken a review of the Traffic Impact Assessment, report reference P6680.004R, prepared by Bitzios Consulting, Version 004, dated 19 September 2025 (TIA), which provides an assessment of the construction and operational impacts of the development on the transport network. TMR note several deficiencies within the report that are listed below: a) The TIA assumes that during the construction stage, 90% of staff arrive by bus from the housed locations in Townsville and ships at the port. It is expected that construction staff will be staying in accommodation /ships at the port. However, there is no further detail provided with regard to the private bus operations. b) The TIA assumes distribution of 60% south and 40% north on Ron McLean Drive for operational phase based on proximity to nearby suburbs. This 60/40 distribution may be too heavily weighted towards the north as far more of the suburban areas nearby are access from the south. c) Assessment results indicate minor increases in delay and queue length with both intersections operating below capacity. There are no detailed outputs from the net delay assessment provided making this difficult to check. d) All staff travel movements within the TIA have been considered on the basis of the modular build of the proposed use and there has been no consideration for alternatives such as on-site construction. e) No information has been provided in relation to the travel movements associated with the source materials/inputs during the operation of the use. This information is required to understand the ongoing freight demands generated by the development, including the type and frequency of deliveries, expected vehicle classes, likely haulage routes, hours of operation and any oversized or over-mass requirements. Without this detail, the operational impacts on the State-controlled road network, including road safety, capacity, pavement loading and maintenance implications, cannot be appropriately assessed. f) As the duration of OSOM traffic movements, including preparation and rectifications, will cause disruption to the use of the road, including freight transport on the primary, and only road train accessible route to

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		the Port of Townsville, the truck decoupling facility, the weigh bridge, and other facilities, details of how road users will be notified and compensated is required. The proponent is requested to: 1. Provide clarification or commitment for the use of private bus operations which are relied on to get 90% of staff to and from the site. If the planned bus operations do not eventuate, the impacts could be far more significant than reported for the construction phase. 2. Assess the scenario where private bus services are not implemented and all staff travel via private vehicle. This assessment must quantify the likely traffic and safety impacts to the State-controlled road network and demonstrate how these would be mitigated. 3. Assess the alternative scenario involving full on-site construction in lieu of the currently proposed modular delivery method. Further justification for the staff distribution during the operational phase or an updated distribution based on a higher proportion of vehicles travelling south. This distribution is considered more representative based on surrounding residential catchments. 4. Provide a detailed operational transport profile outlining all material/input delivery movements, including vehicle types and frequencies, haulage routes and any OSOM requirements proposed for the life of the development. 5. Provide a detailed plan of how road users will be notified of disruptions and how compensation, as required, will be managed.
7	Construction stage pavement impact	The Pavement Impact Assessment (PIA) contained within the TIA assesses the operational phase of the development to the exclusion of construction traffic. Specifically, the assessment is based on 10 loaded and 6 unloaded Class 10 (B-Double) vehicle movements per day across the network. This assessment does not consider the likely impacts of OSOM movements across the network during the construction phase. The proponent is requested to: 1. Undertake an assessment, with all engineering components having appropriate RPEQ certification, that describes how pavement impacts/wear/damage resulting from the movement of these loads will be assessed, what measures can be employed to mitigate impacts and explain why any impacts are not considered excessive. This includes:

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		a) The proponent supplying to TMR a proposed methodology to use for this purpose, with the proposed methodology certified by a suitably qualified RPEQ. b) The proposed methodology being discussed and agreed with TMR upfront and before the actual assessment is commenced. The proponent and the RPEQ engaged will need to be involved in the discussion, etc. c) The assessment considering the impacts due to vertical loads as well as horizontal loads (e.g. impacts on pavement structures and surfacings). d) The proposed methodology must detail procedures for collecting and validating data on the current pavements (e.g. condition of the road section). 2. As part of the assessment listed in item 7.1 above, consider at a minimum the following items: a) The different existing materials and pavement types along the route(s) and the impacts on them (e.g. impact on flexible unbound granular and/or lightly bound pavements with sealed surface, impact on asphalt layers, impacts on any concrete floodways/pavements, if any). b) If high temperatures are possible when the loads are moved and if so if high temperatures exacerbate some impacts (e.g. rutting of asphalt or impact on seals). c) The capacity (e.g. structural capacity) of road shoulders where encroachment is possible. (Note: It appears there will be at least partial encroachment along the entire route due to the width of the unit). d) Impact on surfacings where there are steeper grades on the route (slow moving heavy vehicles/loads may impact surfacings like seals). e) The number of trips/movements for each load/scenario, with detailed consideration of vertical and horizontal loads. f) The potential for deformation, shear, bearing capacity and/or slip failures of the pavements, including shoulders, and/or embankments, including if the materials are wet (e.g. should the pavement be exposed to storm surge/flooding shortly before the move takes place). g) Any limitations that will apply (e.g. timing if there has been recent extreme weather). h) How verification that the pavement is in suitable condition shortly before the loads are moved will be achieved (e.g. if there has been a recent cyclone). i) If alternative routes/options are possible to minimise impacts on the existing road (e.g. construct temporary

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		pavement to eastern shore). j) Tyre sizes and pressures and tyre contact stresses. k) Any limits or constraints that need to be imposed to safely move the load (e.g. maximum axles loads, limits needed to avoid slip failures if this is a risk). 3. In providing a response to items 7.1 and 7.2, note: a) The methodology and assessment are to be documented in a report and certified by a suitably qualified RPEQ. b) The assessment should assess the risks/impacts of potential differential (longitudinal and/or traverse) movements/settlement and impacts in the event there is an unexpected failure (e.g. culvert unexpectedly fails or there is a slip failure in the embankment meaning part of the unit sinks lower than the rest of the unit). c) The methodology and assessment are to explain how Jet Zero will assure TMR that the maximum loads and any conditions placed on the move (by TMR and the suitably qualified RPEQ who undertakes the assessment) are adhered to during the construction stage.
8	Operational pavement impact	Within the submitted PIA, there appears to be errors in the calculation or application of the Background SAR4's, for example: a) Ron McLean Drive section 0.00-0.77 has an AADT of 263 HV's in the against gazettal direction and 343 in the gazettal direction (refer to Table 7.1). b) With the conversion factor of 3.2 SAR4's per HV this should be 841 SAR4's in the against gazettal direction and 1,099 in the gazettal direction. However, Table 7.3 shows the opposite – 1,099 in the against gazettal direction and 841 in the gazettal direction. c) There is an error in Table 7.6 with the loaded SAR4/day – this should be 101 based on 16 x 6.3 – this may be a typo as the total is correct. d) Calculation of the Development generated SAR5's in the report body does not align with the appendix. The proponent is requested to: 1. Provide a revised operational PIA which amends the noted errors in calculating the Background SAR4's and

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		revise the PIA accordingly. 2. Provide detailed net delay outputs and/or SIDRA files to enable thorough review of the net delay assessment. 3. Provide clarification of the Development SAR5's and what has been used in the assessment.
9	Impacts on Colinta Road	The TIA notes potential accelerated pavement damage to Colinta Road caused by heavy vehicle loading associated with the development. TCC requires quantification of costs and mitigation measures for its asset management obligations. The proponent is requested to: 1. Provide an RPEQ certified PIA quantifying life reduction and cost implications for Colinta Road, using Austroads methodology, and recommend mitigation or contributions.
Construction management plan		
10	Construction impacts	The Preliminary Construction Management Plan, prepared by Jet Zero, Revision 0, dated 22 October 2025 (CMP) is required to be updated and provided for review to understand the construction related impacts of the development and alignment with TCC requirements. This is considered a relevant matter for consideration in the SDA application in accordance with section 2.5.6 (transport) and section 2.5.9 (other government matters) of the Townsville SDA Development Scheme. The proponent is requested to: 1. Submit an updated CMP that specifically demonstrates alignment with TCC requirements for construction-phase management, such as: a) Erosion and sediment control. b) Stormwater quality. c) Traffic and haulage management for local roads (Colinta Road), consistent with the TIA and PIA and any updates to these reports required from this information request.

No.	Issue	Information Requested
Ecological assessment		
11	Ecological assessment against TCC framework	In accordance with section 2.5.7 of the Townsville SDA Development Scheme (SDA wide assessment criteria), the environmental values of the premises on which the development is undertaken, and immediate surrounds, are to be identified and managed, consistent with current best practice. The ecological assessment provided focuses on State and Commonwealth matters (MSES, MNES) but does not demonstrate compliance with the Townsville City Plan, Natural Assets Overlay Code (PO1–PO4). Local overlay requirements ensure protection of mapped wetlands, waterways, riparian zones, and ecological corridors within the City Plan framework. The proponent is requested to: 1. Provide a statement of compliance with the Townsville City Plan, Natural Assets Overlay Code, including: a) Identification of mapped overlay features (wetlands, waterways, riparian zones) within or adjacent to the site. b) Demonstration of compliance with PO1–PO4, including avoidance, buffers, and mitigation measures. c) Updated plans showing buffer distances to mapped natural assets and any fauna movement strategies. d) Confirmation that stormwater design (bio-retention basins, contaminated water basins) will not compromise ecological values or hydrological connectivity. e) Ensure the response reconciles ecological findings with stormwater and drainage design and addresses construction-phase risks (erosion, sedimentation, ASS disturbance) consistent with Council's environmental standards.
Utilities		
12	Water supply and sewerage capacity	In accordance with section 2.5.1 and section 2.5.8 of the Townsville SDA Development Scheme (SDA wide assessment criteria) development is to be adequately serviced by water and wastewater infrastructure and designed in accordance with relevant engineering standards. The proponent has not provided a water supply and sewerage capacity assessment to confirm servicing feasibility and identify any required upgrades to maintain network performance standards.

No.	Issue	Information Requested
		The proponent is requested to: 1. Submit an RPEQ certified report providing: a) Details of the water supply and sewerage capacity of the development site. b) Details of the anticipated demand for water and sewerage services. c) An assessment against TCC network capacity, and any required augmentation works.
13	Stormwater management plan	In accordance with section 2.5.17 of the Townsville SDA Development Scheme (SDA wide assessment criteria) development is to be located, designed, constructed and operated to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on environmental values of receiving waters. The Stormwater Management Plan, project no. 12679528, revision 0, prepared by GHD Pty Ltd, dated 23 October 2025 (SMP) shows a conflict at the western boundary. Figure 13 shows a bio-retention basin overlapping the existing watercourse and contaminated water basin, while the development plans and FIA suggest the watercourse remains in natural form. The SMP also needs to provide clarity on the lawful point of discharge, construction stage drainage, and integration with contaminated water management. These are essential for TCC's stormwater network performance and compliance with local standards. The proponent is requested to: 1. Provide an updated SMP, including: a) Confirmation of treatment at the western boundary, specifically whether the watercourse in this area will remain in its natural form or comprise a bio-retention basin. As part of the response, reconcile the SMP, FIA, and development plans and include hydraulic details and implications for waterway barrier works. b) Confirmation of the lawful point of discharge for the development site. c) Details of how drainage will be managed during construction. d) Details of how drainage will be integrated with the site's contaminated water management.

Planning instruments – Priority Port Master Plan and Port Overlay		
14	Port Master Plan	The SDA application does not reference the Priority Port of Townsville Master Plan or the Port Overlay, notwithstanding that the subject land is within the broader infrastructure and supply chain corridors and port industry and commerce precincts associated with the priority Port. These instruments identify strategic directions, land-use outcomes and environmental management objectives relevant to Port-related development and associated corridors. An assessment against Priority Port of Townsville Master Plan and Port Overlay is considered necessary to demonstrate compliance with the overall objectives for the Townsville SDA, as stated in the Development Scheme. The proponent is requested to: 1. Demonstrate how the proposed development addresses and is consistent with the Priority Port of Townsville Master Plan and Port Overlay, including relevant outcomes for: a) Infrastructure and supply chain corridors precinct. b) Port industry and commerce precinct.
<u>Advice note:</u> Any referral agency comments do not replace the need to apply for other approvals that may be required for the development to proceed, particularly approvals required for land owned and/or controlled by the Port of Townsville Limited (POTL) or approval for oversize, overmass loads from HVNL. Any proposed development on Port land will be subject to separate development applications and landowner's consent processes directly with POTL. Any on-Port components will be assessed under the applicable planning framework and operational requirements at that time. Any changes or rectification within the state corridor to facilitate the required traffic movements will require approval in accordance with the <i>Transport Infrastructure Act 1994</i>.		