APPENDIX I

Response to State Code 1: Development in a state-controlled road environment

State code 1: Development in a state-controlled road environment

Table 1.1 Development in general

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
Buildings, structures, infrastructure, services and utilities		
PO1 The location of the development does not create a safety hazard for users of the **state-controlled road.**	**AO1.1** Development is not located in a **state-controlled road**. AND **AO1.2** Development can be maintained without requiring access to a **state-controlled road**.	**Complies with AO1.1** The development is not located in the SCR. AND **Complies with AO1.2** The development is wholly contained within the subject site.
PO2 The design and construction of the development does not adversely impact the **structural integrity** or physical condition of the **state-controlled road** or **road transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO2** All construction will be carried out in accordance with current local and state policies and direction. It is not anticipated the development will impact the structural integrity of Stuart Drive or University Road.
PO3 The location of the development does not obstruct **road transport infrastructure** or adversely impact the operating performance of the **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO3** The development is wholly contained within the subject site.
PO4 The location, placement, design and operation of advertising devices, visible from the **state-controlled road**, do not create a safety hazard for users of the **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO4** All advertising will be wholly contained within the development site and sympathetic to the surrounding locality.
PO5 The design and construction of buildings and **structures** does not create a safety hazard by distracting users of the **state-controlled road**.	**AO5.1** Facades of buildings and **structures** fronting the **state-controlled road** are made of non-reflective materials. AND **AO5.2** Facades of buildings and **structures** do not direct or reflect point light sources into the face of oncoming traffic on the **state-controlled road**.	**Complies with AO5.1** The façade of the building fronting the SCR does not incorporate reflective materials. AND **Complies with AO5.2** All materials used for the façades of the development fronting the SCR will not be reflective so to that they do not direct or reflect light into oncoming traffic.

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
	AND **AO5.3** External lighting of buildings and **structures** is not directed into the face of oncoming traffic on the **state-controlled road**. AND **AO5.4** External lighting of buildings and **structures** does not involve flashing or laser lights.	AND **Complies with AO5.3** All lighting associated with the development will be directed away from the SCR. AND **Complies with AO5.4** No flashing or laser lights are proposed. Standard conditions to safeguard these aspects are expected.
PO6 Road, pedestrian and bikeway bridges over a **state-controlled road** are designed and constructed to prevent projectiles from being thrown onto the **state-controlled road**.	**AO6.1** Road, pedestrian and bikeway bridges over the **state-controlled road** include throw protection screens in accordance with section 4.11 of the Design Criteria for Bridges and Other Structures Manual, Department of Transport and Main Roads, 2020.	**Not applicable** No roads or pedestrian and bikeway bridges are proposed over the SCR as part of this development.
Landscaping		
PO7 The location of landscaping does not create a safety hazard for users of the **state-controlled road**.	**AO7.1** Landscaping is not located in a **state-controlled road**. AND **AO7.2** Landscaping can be maintained without requiring access to a **state-controlled road**. AND **AO7.3** Landscaping does not block or obscure the sight lines for vehicular access to a **state-controlled road**.	**Complies with AO7.1** No landscaping is proposed within the SCR. AND **Complies with AO7.2** All proposed landscaping is contained within the site and does not require access to the SCR for maintenance. AND **Complies with AO7.3** No trees, shrubs or bushes are proposed within the site fronting the SCR that could obscure sight lights.
Stormwater and overland flow		
PO8 Stormwater run-off or overland flow from the development site does not create or exacerbate a safety hazard for users of the **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO8** Stormwater management was assessed by Northern Consulting Engineers which detailed that stormwater is to be conveyed through the site through 2 primary culverts at the crossing of the drainage. Local run-off

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
		within the site will be conveyed to legal points of discharge via an underground pit and pipe network, with surcharge flows conveyed overland in the roadways and open corridors. Stormwater drainage shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Townsville City Plan – Planning Scheme Policy – Schedule 6.4.4.4 Stormwater Drainage Design and associated reference documents. The design intent will ensure that the development does not discharge into the SCR to ensure that there are no increases in stormwater volume being discharged. For further information refer to the Engineering Report in ***Appendix E.***
PO9 Stormwater run-off or overland flow from the development site does not result in a material worsening of the operating performance of the **state-controlled road** or **road transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Compiles with PO9** As above.
PO10 Stormwater run-off or overland flow from the development site does not adversely impact the **structural integrity** or physical condition of the **state-controlled road** or **road transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Compiles with PO10** As above.
PO11 Development ensures that stormwater is lawfully discharged.	**AO11.1** Development does not create any new points of discharge to a **state-controlled road.** AND **AO11.2** Development does not concentrate flows to a **state-controlled road**. AND **AO11.3** Stormwater run-off is discharged to a **lawful point of discharge**. AND	**Complies with AO11.1** No new points of discharge are created to the SCR. AND **Complies with AO11.2** Stormwater flows are demonstrated in the Engineering Report in ***Appendix E.*** AND **Complies with AO11.3** As above. For further information refer to the Engineering Report in ***Appendix E.*** AND

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
	AO11.4 Development does not worsen the condition of an existing **lawful point of discharge** to the **state-controlled road**.	**Complies with AO11.4** As above. For further information refer to the Engineering Report in ***Appendix E.***
Flooding		
PO12 Development does not result in a material worsening of flooding impacts within a **state-controlled road**.	**AO12.1** For all flood events up to 1% **annual exceedance probability**, development results in negligible impacts (within +/- 10mm) to existing flood levels within a **state-controlled road**. AND **AO12.2** For all flood events up to 1% **annual exceedance probability**, development results in negligible impacts (up to a 10% increase) to existing peak velocities within a **state-controlled road**. AND **AO12.3** For all flood events up to 1% **annual exceedance probability**, development results in negligible impacts (up to a 10% increase) to existing time of submergence of a **state-controlled road**.	**Complies with AO12.1** Given the magnitude of flood hazard over the site, Northern Consulting Engineers were engaged to carry out an extensive flood impact assessment (FIA) using a fine scale mini TUFLOW model based on inputs and boundary conditions derived from Townsville City Council's new Ross River Flood Study 2021. The scope included: • Model the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) critical duration design event to compare the mini-model baseline to the Ross River (2021) model; and • Model the 0.5%, 1% and 50% AEP critical duration design events to determine the extent and magnitude of impacts to the existing flood characteristics. The FIA demonstrates that the proposed development can proceed without any actionable impacts to the surrounding properties or the adjacent state-controlled roads. The outcome of the assessment incorporates mitigation measures inclusive of significant detention storage and overbank widening in the north east, overbank widening either side of the natural stream in the upstream section, use of a new creek crossing to moderate flows and a low height levee in the north of the site.

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
		For further information, refer to the FIA included in Appendix iii of the Engineering Report in *Appendix E*. Given the above, the development complies with the flood hazard overlay code. The detail design including all mitigation measures are to be confirmed as part of the Operational Works application and implemented prior to the release of the Plan of Survey / commencement of the use on site.
Drainage Infrastructure		
PO13 Drainage infrastructure does not create a safety hazard for users in the **state-controlled road**.	**AO13.1** Drainage infrastructure is wholly contained within the development site, except at the **lawful point of discharge**. AND **AO13.2** Drainage infrastructure can be maintained without requiring access to a **state-controlled road**.	**Complies with AO13.1** All infrastructure is contained within the development site as demonstrated in the Engineering Report in ***Appendix E.*** AND **Complies with AO13.2** All infrastructure is contained within the development site and does not require access to the SCR for maintenance.
PO14 Drainage infrastructure associated with, or within, a **state-controlled road** is constructed, and designed to ensure the **structural integrity** and physical condition of existing drainage infrastructure and the surrounding drainage network.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO14** As above.

Table 1.2 Vehicular access, road layout and local roads

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
Vehicular access to a state-controlled road or within 100 metres of a state-controlled road intersection		
PO15 The location, design and operation of a **new or changed access** to a **state-controlled road** does not compromise the safety of users of the **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Not applicable** No new or changed access to a SCR is proposed.
PO16 The location, design and operation of a **new or changed access** does not adversely impact the **functional requirements** of the **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Not applicable** No new or changed access to a SCR is proposed.

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
PO17 The location, design and operation of a **new or changed access** is consistent with the **future intent** of the **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Not applicable** No new or changed access to a SCR is proposed.
PO18 New or changed access is consistent with the access for the relevant **limited access road policy**: 1. **LAR 1** where direct access is prohibited; or 2. **LAR 2** where access may be permitted, subject to assessment.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Not applicable** No new or changed access to a SCR is proposed.
PO19 New or changed access to a **local road** within 100 metres of an intersection with a **state-controlled road** does not compromise the safety of users of the **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Not applicable** No new or changed access to a SCR is proposed.
PO20 New or changed access to a **local road** within 100 metres of an intersection with a **state-controlled road** does not adversely impact on the operating performance of the intersection.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Not applicable** No new or changed access to a SCR is proposed.
Public passenger transport and active transport		
PO21 Development does not compromise the safety of users of **public passenger transport infrastructure**, **public passenger services** and **active transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO21** Refer to the TIA included in ***Appendix F.***
PO22 Development maintains the ability for people to access **public passenger transport infrastructure, public passenger services** and **active transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO22** Refer to the TIA included in ***Appendix F.***
PO23 Development does not adversely impact the operating performance of **public passenger transport infrastructure, public passenger services** and **active transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO23** Refer to the TIA included in ***Appendix F.***
PO24 Development does not adversely impact the **structural integrity** or physical condition of **public passenger transport infrastructure** and **active transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO24** Refer to the TIA included in ***Appendix F.***

Table 1.3 Network impacts

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
PO25 Development does not compromise the safety of users of the **state-controlled road** network.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO25** Given scale and intensity of the proposed development, its proximity to high traffic roadways and the above-mentioned upgrades currently being carried out, a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) was required to be undertaken to ensure the development would comply with local and state government requirements. A TIA was prepared by Northern Consulting Engineers which concluded that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, the development is not expected to impact the road network. The assessment demonstrates that the existing intersection of Gartrell Drive and Shanahan Drive is expected to operate at acceptable levels of service inclusive of the proposed development generated traffic through to the design year 2036 The TIA also confirms that the upgrades to the Gartrell Drive / Stuart Drive intersection currently being performed by TMR will be suitable for the overall development of the subject site. A copy of the TIA is included in Appendix iv of the Engineering Report in ***Appendix E.***
PO26 Development ensures **no net worsening** of the operating performance of the **state-controlled road** network.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO26** Refer to the TIA included in ***Appendix F.***
PO27 Traffic movements are not directed onto a **state-controlled road** where they can be accommodated on the **local road** network.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO27** Refer to the TIA included in ***Appendix F.***
PO28 Development involving haulage exceeding 10,000 tonnes per year does not adversely impact the pavement of a **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Not applicable.**
PO29 Development does not impede delivery of **planned upgrades** of **state-controlled roads**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO29** The TIA considers the development against the significant road works that are being completed along

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
		Stuart Drive (The Townsville Connection Road). Given the timing, the development will no impede the delivery of these works.
PO30 Development does not impede delivery of **corridor improvements** located entirely within the **state-controlled road corridor**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO30** As above.

Table 1.4 Filling, excavation, building foundations and retaining structures

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
PO31 Development does not create a safety hazard for users of the **state-controlled road** or **road transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO31** No building foundations or retaining structures are proposed that would create safety hazards.
PO32 Development does not adversely impact the operating performance of the **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO32** Refer to the TIA included in ***Appendix F.***
PO33 Development does not undermine, damage or cause subsidence of a **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO33** Refer to the Engineering Report included in ***Appendix E.***
PO34 Development does not cause ground water disturbance in a **state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO34** Refer to the Engineering Report included in ***Appendix E.***
PO35 Excavation, boring, piling, blasting and fill compaction do not adversely impact the physical condition or **structural integrity** of a **state-controlled road** or **road transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO35** Excavation and filling will be approved by Townsville City Council and managed appropriately.
PO36 Filling and excavation associated with the construction of **new or changed access** do not compromise the operation or capacity of existing drainage infrastructure for a **state-controlled road.**	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Complies with PO36** All work will be carried out in accordance with all relevant Australian standards and dtmr policy.

Table 1.5 Environmental emissions

Statutory note: Where a **state-controlled road** is co-located in the same transport corridor as a railway, the development should instead comply with Environmental emissions in State code 2: Development in a railway environment.

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
Reconfiguring a lot		
Involving the creation of 5 or fewer new residential lots adjacent to a state-controlled road or type 1 multi-modal corridor		
PO37 Development minimises free field noise intrusion from a **state-controlled road.**	**AO37.1** Development provides a noise barrier or earth mound which is designed, sited and constructed:	**Not applicable** The development does not create residential lots.

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
	1. to achieve the maximum free field acoustic levels in reference table 2 (item 2.1); 2. in accordance with: a. Chapter 7 integrated noise barrier design of the Transport Noise Management Code of Practice: Volume 1 (Road Traffic Noise), Department of Transport and Main Roads, 2013; b. Technical Specification-MRTS15 Noise Fences, Transport and Main Roads, 2019; c. Technical Specification-MRTS04 General Earthworks, Transport and Main Roads, 2020. OR **AO37.2** Development achieves the maximum free field acoustic levels in reference table 2 (item 2.1) by **alternative noise attenuation measures** where it is not practical to provide a noise barrier or earth mound. OR **AO37.3** Development provides a **solid gap-free fence** or other **solid gap-free structure** along the full extent of the boundary closest to the **state-controlled road**.	
Involving the creation of 6 or more new residential lots adjacent to a state-controlled road or type 1 multi-modal corridor		
PO38 Reconfiguring a lot minimises free field noise intrusion from a **state-controlled road.**	**AO38.1** Development provides noise barrier or earth mound which is designed, sited and constructed: 1. to achieve the maximum free field acoustic levels in reference table 2 (item 2.1); 2. in accordance with: a. Chapter 7 integrated noise barrier design of the Transport Noise Management Code of Practice: Volume 1 (Road Traffic Noise), Department of Transport and Main Roads, 2013; b. Technical Specification-MRTS15 Noise Fences, Transport and Main Roads, 2019;	**Not applicable** The development does not create residential lots.

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
	c. Technical Specification-MRTS04 General Earthworks, Transport and Main Roads, 2020. OR **AO38.2** Development achieves the maximum free field acoustic levels in reference table 2 (item 2.1) by **alternative noise attenuation measures** where it is not practical to provide a noise barrier or earth mound.	
Material change of use (accommodation activity)		
Ground floor level requirements adjacent to a state-controlled road or type 1 multi-modal corridor		
PO39 Development minimises noise intrusion from a **state-controlled road** in **private open space**.	**AO39.1** Development provides a noise barrier or earth mound which is designed, sited and constructed: 1. to achieve the maximum free field acoustic levels in reference table 2 (item 2.2) for **private open space** at the ground floor level; 2. in accordance with: a. Chapter 7 integrated noise barrier design of the Transport Noise Management Code of Practice: Volume 1 (Road Traffic Noise), Department of Transport and Main Roads, 2013; b. Technical Specification-MRTS15 Noise Fences, Transport and Main Roads, 2019; c. Technical Specification-MRTS04 General Earthworks, Transport and Main Roads, 2020. OR **AO39.2** Development achieves the maximum free field acoustic level in reference table 2 (item 2.2) for **private open space** by **alternative noise attenuation measures** where it is not practical to provide a noise barrier or earth mound.	**Complies with AO39.1** A noise impact assessment and mitigation strategy was prepared for the development by Simpson Engineering Group. The acoustic fence will vary in height from 2.5m in some locations to 4m in others. The findings of the Noise Impact Assessment suggest that it may be desirable to incorporate transparent elements in parts of the acoustic fence. Final design outcomes will be provided at detail design stage. A copy of the assessment is included in ***Appendix F.***
PO40 Development (excluding a **relevant residential building** or **relocated building)** minimises noise intrusion from a **state-controlled road** in **habitable rooms** at the facade.	**AO40.1** Development (excluding a **relevant residential building** or **relocated building**) provides a noise barrier or earth mound which is designed, sited and constructed:	**Complies with AO40.1** Refer to the noise impact assessment included in ***Appendix F.***

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
	1. to achieve the maximum building façade acoustic level in reference table 1 (item 1.1) for **habitable rooms**; 2. in accordance with: a. Chapter 7 integrated noise barrier design of the Transport Noise Management Code of Practice: Volume 1 (Road Traffic Noise), Department of Transport and Main Roads, 2013; b. Technical Specification-MRTS15 Noise Fences, Transport and Main Roads, 2019; c. Technical Specification-MRTS04 General Earthworks, Transport and Main Roads, 2020. OR **AO40.2** Development (excluding a **relevant residential building** or **relocated building**) achieves the maximum building façade acoustic level in reference table 1 (item 1.1) for **habitable rooms** by **alternative noise attenuation measures** where it is not practical to provide a noise barrier or earth mound.	
PO41 Habitable rooms (excluding a **relevant residential building** or **relocated building**) are designed and constructed using materials to achieve the maximum internal acoustic level in reference table 3 (item 3.1).	No acceptable outcome is provided.	**Complies with PO41** Refer to the noise impact assessment included in ***Appendix F.***
Above ground floor level requirements (accommodation activity) adjacent to a state-controlled road or type 1 multi-modal corridor		
PO42 Balconies, podiums, and roof decks include: 1. a continuous **solid gap-free structure** or balustrade (excluding gaps required for drainage purposes to comply with the Building Code of Australia); 2. highly acoustically absorbent material treatment for the total area of the soffit above balconies, podiums, and roof decks.	No acceptable outcome is provided.	**Complies with PO42** Refer to the noise impact assessment included in ***Appendix F.***
PO43 Habitable rooms (excluding a **relevant residential building** or **relocated building**) are designed and constructed using materials to achieve the maximum internal acoustic level in reference table 3 (item 3.1).	No acceptable outcome is provided.	**Complies with PO43** Refer to the noise impact assessment included in ***Appendix F.***

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
Material change of use (other uses)		
Ground floor level requirements (childcare centre, educational establishment, hospital) adjacent to a state-controlled road or type 1 multi-modal corridor		
PO44 Development: 1. provides a noise barrier or earth mound that is designed, sited and constructed: a. to achieve the maximum free field acoustic level in reference table 2 (item 2.3) for all **outdoor education areas** and **outdoor play areas**; b. in accordance with: i. Chapter 7 integrated noise barrier design of the Transport Noise Management Code of Practice: Volume 1 (Road Traffic Noise), Department of Transport and Main Roads, 2013; ii. Technical Specification-MRTS15 Noise Fences, Transport and Main Roads, 2019; iii. Technical Specification-MRTS04 General Earthworks, Transport and Main Roads, 2020; or 2. achieves the maximum free field acoustic level in reference table 2 (item 2.3) for all **outdoor education areas** and **outdoor play areas** by **alternative noise attenuation measures** where it is not practical to provide a noise barrier or earth mound.	No acceptable outcome is provided.	**Not applicable**
PO45 Development involving a **childcare centre** or **educational establishment**: 1. provides a noise barrier or earth mound that is designed, sited and constructed: 2. to achieve the maximum building facade acoustic level in reference table 1 (item 1.2); 3. in accordance with: a. Chapter 7 integrated noise barrier design of the Transport Noise Management Code of Practice: Volume 1 (Road Traffic Noise),	No acceptable outcome is provided.	**Not applicable**

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
Department of Transport and Main Roads, 2013; b. Technical Specification-MRTS15 Noise Fences, Transport and Main Roads, 2019; c. Technical Specification-MRTS04 General Earthworks, Transport and Main Roads, 2020; or 4. achieves the maximum building facade acoustic level in reference table 1 (item 1.2) by **alternative noise attenuation measures** where it is not practical to provide a noise barrier or earth mound.		
PO46 Development involving: 1. **indoor education areas** and **indoor play areas**; or 2. sleeping rooms in a **childcare centre**; or 3. **patient care areas** in a **hospital** achieves the maximum internal acoustic level in reference table 3 (items 3.2-3.4).	No acceptable outcome is provided.	**Not applicable**
Above ground floor level requirements (childcare centre, educational establishment, hospital) adjacent to a state-controlled road or type 1 multi-modal corridor		
PO47 Development involving a **childcare centre** or **educational establishment** which have balconies, podiums or elevated **outdoor play areas** predicted to exceed the maximum free field acoustic level in reference table 2 (item 2.3) due to noise from a **state-controlled road** are provided with: 1. a continuous **solid gap-free structure** or balustrade (excluding gaps required for drainage purposes to comply with the Building Code of Australia); 2. highly acoustically absorbent material treatment for the total area of the soffit above balconies or elevated **outdoor play areas**.	No acceptable outcome is provided.	**Not applicable**

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
PO48 Development including: 1. **indoor education areas** and **indoor play areas** in a **childcare centre** or **educational establishment**; or 2. sleeping rooms in a **childcare centre**; or 3. **patient care areas** in a **hospital** located above ground level, is designed and constructed to achieve the maximum internal acoustic level in reference table 3 (items 3.2-3.4).	No acceptable outcome is provided.	**Not applicable** .
Air, light and vibration		
PO49 Private open space, **outdoor education areas** and **outdoor play areas** are protected from air quality impacts from a **state-controlled road**.	**AO49.1** Each dwelling or unit has access to a **private open space** which is shielded from a **state-controlled road** by a building, **solid gap-free fence**, or other **solid gap-free structure**. OR **AO49.2** Each **outdoor education area** and **outdoor play area** is shielded from a **state-controlled road** by a building, **solid gap-free fence,** or other **solid gap-free structure**.	**Not applicable**
PO50 Patient care areas within **hospitals** are protected from vibration impacts from a **state-controlled road** or **type 1 multi-modal corridor**.	**AO50.1 Hospitals** are designed and constructed to ensure vibration in the patient treatment area does not exceed a vibration dose value of $0.1m/s^{1.75}$. AND **AO50.2 Hospitals** are designed and constructed to ensure vibration in the ward of a **patient care area** does not exceed a vibration dose value of $0.4m/s^{1.75}$.	**Not applicable**
PO51 Development is designed and sited to ensure light from infrastructure within, and from users of, a **state-controlled road** or **type 1 multi-modal corridor**, does not: 1. intrude into buildings during night hours (10pm to 6am);	No acceptable outcomes are prescribed.	**Not applicable**

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
2. create unreasonable disturbance during evening hours (6pm to 10pm).		

Table 1.6: Development in a future state-controlled road environment

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
PO52 Development does not impede delivery of a **future state-controlled road**.	**AO52.1** Development is not located in a **future state-controlled road**. OR ALL OF THE FOLLOWING APPLY: **AO52.2** Development does not involve filling and excavation of, or material changes to, a **future state-controlled road**. AND **AO52.3** The intensification of lots does not occur within a **future state-controlled road**. AND **AO52.4** Development does not result in the landlocking of parcels once a **future state-controlled road** is delivered.	**Not applicable** A miniscule portion of land is identified as future state-controlled road as shown on the Matters of Interest Report in ***Appendix G.*** It is in the south west corner and was for the Townsville Southern Access Corrdior (Stage 2) which has been delivered. Given the above, no further consideration has been made against the PO52-PO56 of State Code 1.
PO53 The location and design of **new or changed access** does not create a safety hazard for users of a **future state-controlled road**.	**AO53.1** Development does not include **new or changed access** to a **future state-controlled road**.	**Not applicable**
PO54 Filling, excavation, building foundations and **retaining structures** do not undermine, damage or cause subsidence of a **future state-controlled road**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Not applicable**
PO55 Development does not result in a material worsening of stormwater, flooding, overland flow or drainage impacts in a **future state-controlled road** or **road transport infrastructure**.	No acceptable outcome is prescribed.	**Not applicable**

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes	Response
PO56 Development ensures that stormwater is lawfully discharged.	AO56.1 Development does not create any new points of discharge to a **future state-controlled road**. AND AO56.2 Development does not concentrate flows to a **future state-controlled road**. AND AO56.3 Stormwater run-off is discharged to a **lawful point of discharge**. AND AO56.4 Development does not worsen the condition of an existing **lawful point of discharge** to the **future state-controlled road**.	Not applicable