8.2.2. Airport environs overlay code

8.2.2.1. Application

This code applies to the assessment of development if it is identified as an applicable code for development, as specified in the assessment benchmarks column in the tables of assessment located in Part 5 of the planning scheme.

When using this code, reference should be made to section 5.3.2 and where applicable, section 5.3.3 located in Part 5.

All subject matter in this code is applicable to the development assessment, unless the following circumstance arises:

- (1) The heading of a specific benchmarks for assessment table specifies otherwise; or
- (2) A heading within a specific benchmark for assessment table specifies that the outcomes apply to a specific type of development or to development at a specific location; or
- (3) A performance outcome or acceptable outcome specifies that the outcomes apply to a specific type of development or to development at a specific location.

In the circumstance where point (2) or point (3) above arises the following applies:

- (1) the development assessment outcomes apply only to the type of development specified or only to development at the location specified; and
- (2) the development must still be assessed against all other general subject matter of the code.

8.2.2.2. Purpose

The purpose of the airport environs overlay code is to ensure that:

- (1) the current and future operations of the Rockhampton airport are not adversely impacted by development; and
- (2) development within the vicinity of the Rockhampton airport is not adversely impacted by the operation of the airport and aviation facilities.

8.2.2.3. Overall outcomes

The purposes of the code will be achieved through the following overall outcomes:

- (1) the obstacle limitation surface surrounding the airport and aviation facilities is protected from intrusion by development;
- (2) development near the airport does not create a hazard to aircraft operations by way of smoke, flames, lighting or attraction of birds, bats and flying foxes; and
- (3) development does not result in sensitive land uses occurring at locations likely to result in land use conflict due to proximity to the Rockhampton airport and associated operational areas.

8.2.2.4. Specific benchmarks for assessment

Table 8.2.2.4.1 — Outcomes for assessable development

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes
Airport environs – Australian Noise Exposure Forecast contours	
PO1	AO1.1
Development involving sensitive land use does not occur at locations that are likely to result in adverse impacts on human health due to aircraft noise exposure.	Development does not result in sensitive land use located within the twenty (20) to twenty-five (25) Australian Noise Exposure Forecast contour. Editor's note: Reference should be made to the definition of sensitive land use contained within Table SC1.2.2 – administrative definitions.

Performance outcomes	Acceptable outcomes
	AO1.2
	Reconfiguring a lot does not result in lots located within the twenty (20) to twenty-five (25) Australian Noise Exposure Forecast contour.

Editor's note: Where the acceptable outcomes cannot be met, a Noise Assessment Report prepared by an appropriately qualified acoustic consultant may be prepared to demonstrate compliance with this performance outcome.

Airport environs - obstacle limitation surface

PO₂

Development does not involve permanent, temporary or transient physical obstructions (natural or man-made) which adversely affect operational airspace.

Editor's notes:

- Development which exceeds the obstacle limitation surface contour levels (expressed in metres AHD) may be referred by Council to the airport operator whose advice and decision on the proposal will be considered by Council in deciding a development application.
- Obstacle limitation surface contour height restrictions prevail over the acceptable building heights detailed in zone codes.

No acceptable outcome is nominated.

Editor's note: A development proposal involving a building, structure, crane or other construction equipment which encroaches into the operational airspace of a Leased Federal or other strategic airport must be referred to the airport manager for assessment, who will on refer the proposal to the Australian Government if required. Encroachments into a Height Restriction Zone for a defence or joint-user airfield must be referred to the Department of Defence (DoD) for assessment. Refer to the SPP guidelines for more information regarding the Australian Government's role and assessment processes for intrusions into operational airspace of strategic airports.

PO₃

Development does not generate emissions which will significantly increase air turbulence, reduce visibility or compromise the operation of aircraft engines in a strategic airport's operational airspace.

No acceptable outcome is nominated.

Editor's note: A development proposal involving emission of airborne particulates that may impair visibility in operational airspace must be referred to the airport manager who will on refer the proposal to CASA for assessment. Proposals with the potential to affect visibility in a Height Restriction Zone for a defence or joint-user airfield must be referred to DoD for assessment. Practice notes 1 and 2 of the SPP guideline: Strategic airports and aviation facilities provide more information regarding the Australian Government's role and assessment processes for intrusions into operational airspace of strategic airports. It is recommended proponents seek CASA or DoD advice during pre-lodgement stage of the development assessment process.

Airport environs - distance to runways overlay

PO4

Development and any associated processes do not materially increase the risk of creating wildlife hazards in an airport's operational airspace by attracting a significant number of flying vertebrates such as birds, flying foxes or bats.

AO4.1

Moderate and high risk land uses identified in Table 8.2.2.4.2, do not occur unless a report is prepared by an appropriately qualified wildlife management expert which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the assessment manager that the implementation of wildlife management measures mitigates risks to the airport's operational airspace to an acceptable level.

Editor's note: A development proposal in the vicinity of a strategic airport that may increase risk of wildlife strike should be referred to the airport manager for assessment. A development proposal in the vicinity of a defence or joint-user airfield that may increase risk of wildlife strike should be referred to DoD for assessment.

Where local government seek to approve land uses which may increase the risk of wildlife strike near existing airports, steps should be taken to mitigate risk in consultation with the airport manager and qualified bird and wildlife management experts.

Performance outcomes

Acceptable outcomes

Airport environs - artificial lighting

PO5

Development does not involve external lighting or reflective surfaces which may appear to be an airport runway, or in any other way distract or confuse pilots.

Editor's note: The standards specified in Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) Guidelines: Lighting in the vicinity of aerodromes: Advice to lighting designers may be used to demonstrate compliance with this performance outcome.

AO5.1

Development within the lighting buffer zone for the strategic airport does not include any of the following types of outdoor lighting:

- (a) straight parallel lines of lighting 500 metres to 1000 metres long;
- (b) flare plumes;
- (c) upward shining lights;
- (d) flashing lights;
- (e) laser lights;
- (f) sodium lights;
- (a) reflective surfaces.

AO5.2

Development within the lighting buffer zone for the strategic airport does not emit light that will exceed the maximum light intensity specified for

Editor's note: For further information on lighting buffer zones, reference should be made to the National Airports Safeguarding Framework Guideline E: Managing the Risk of Distractions to Pilots from Lighting in the Vicinity of Airports. In general, for airport light restriction zones the maximum intensity of light sources measured at three (3) degrees above the horizontal is as follows:

- Light Restriction Zone A: 0 candelas;
- Light Restriction Zone B: 50 candelas;
- Light Restriction Zone C: 150 candelas; Light Restriction Zone D: 450 candelas.

Despite the above Light Restriction Zone standards, written confirmation is to be sought from the airport manager to confirm all lighting requirements, as there may be overriding factors which require more restrictive controls to avoid conflict with airport operations.

Editor's note: A development proposal within six (6) kilometres of a strategic airport involving installation of external lighting that is likely to affect aircraft operations must be referred to the airport manager for assessment who will refer the proposal to the Australian Government if required.

Both the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) (under the Civil Aviation Act 1988 and Regulation 94 of the Civil Aviation Regulations 1988) and the Department of Defence (DoD) have legislative powers to cause lighting which may cause distraction, confusion or glare to pilots flying aircraft to be turned off or modified.

Lighting design matters should be addressed during pre-lodgement stage of the development assessment process to avoid CASA or DoD directives to modify lighting after it has been installed. CASA can provide advice about the design and installation of lighting within six (6) kilometres of a strategic airport on the request of local government or an applicant.

Table 8.2.2.4.2 — Land uses associated with increases in wildlife strikes and hazards

Column 1: High Risk Uses Column 2: Moderate Risk Uses (a) Aquaculture involving: (a) Animal husbandry involving: (i) fish processing/packaging plant; (i) a cattle farm; (b) Cropping involving: (ii) a dairy farm; (i) a turf farm; (b) Environment facility: (ii) a fruit tree farm; (i) conservation estate (all other); (c) Environment facility involving: (c) Intensive animal industry involving: (i) conservation estate wetlands; (i) Poultry; (d) High impact industry involving: (d) Major sport, recreation and entertainment

Column 1: High Risk Uses

- (i) food processing plant;
- (e) Intensive animal industry involving:
 - (i) A piggery;
- (f) Low Impact Industry involving:
 - (i) food processing plant;
- (g) Major sport, recreation and entertainment facility involving:
 - (i) showgrounds;
- (h) Medium impact industry involving:
 - (i) food processing plant;
- (i) Outdoor sport and recreation involving:
 - (i) showgrounds;
- (j) Utility installation involving:
 - (i) Transfer, composting or disposal of food, organic material or other putrescible waste.

Column 2: Moderate Risk Uses

facility (if not involving showgrounds);

- (e) Outdoor sport and recreation (if not involving showgrounds);
- (f) Park;
- (g) Utility installation involving:
 - (i) Sewage and wastewater treatment;
 - (ii) Disposal or transfer of non-putrescible waste.