



10 July 2026

Our ref: 57386-001-01
Your ref: MCU26/0009
QA: es.sm

Assessment Manager
Burdekin Shire Council
145 Young Street
AYR QLD 4807

Via email: planning@burdekin.qld.gov.au

Attention: Development Assessment

Dear Sir/Madam,

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION: MCU26/0009

**Development Permit for Material Change of Use – High Impact Industry (Horticultural Product Processing Facility)
457, 459 and 461 Trent Road, Alva**

We refer to the above and provide the following submission with respect to the proposed development on land located at 457, 459 and 461 Trent Road, Alva for a High Impact Industry use being a *Horticultural Product Processing Facility*.

The submission is made on behalf of Mr Frank Oar pursuant to Section 53(6) of the *Planning Act 2016*.

Mr Oar and his wife are long term residents in the area and were drawn to the amenity and rural character of the locality when settling. They have reasonable expectations that amenity and character will be protected by reference to outcomes of the Planning Scheme.

Residing at 449 Trent Road, Alva the submitter has had numerous negative experiences with users of the existing gravel access track adjacent to his dwelling with specific regard to traffic, excessive speeding and frequent dust generation. The dwelling is located approximately 60m from the access track.

The submitter is in favour of appropriate development where known impacts are shown to have been fully addressed, and where the scale and nature of development addresses expected character of the area and observes its surrounds. It is submitted the application as made, does not do so.

The proposed development is to be established within an existing, though vacant, building that is embedded within an existing aquaculture facility. The use of existing GFA on the site should not be relied upon as justification for limiting the assessment of the proposed development, there is need for a full assessment of introduced and cumulative impacts.

A horticulture processing facility is a distinct land use with different operational characteristics, including potentially different traffic generation, heavy vehicle movements, hours of operation, noise, dust and servicing requirements. It, itself, needs to demonstrate, through appropriate assessment and supporting information, that the



impacts arising from the proposed use have been properly considered and that the relevant assessment benchmarks of the Planning Scheme are satisfied. These impacts must be considered further in context of the current lawful operations, including that of the aquaculture facility.

The application fails to adequately address key issues relating to traffic generation, road safety and dust, notwithstanding that these impacts are already experienced by adjoining landowners. In addition, the limited operational information provided does not enable a proper assessment of the scale, intensity and potential impacts of the proposed horticultural product processing facility.

In summary, the grounds of this submission are:

1. Inadequate assessment of traffic generation and road safety;
2. Inadequate assessment of dust impacts arising on an unsealed track adjacent to an existing residence; and
3. Insufficient operational detail to inform full impact assessment and permit the appropriate imposition of conditions to manage and mitigate impacts.

1. Traffic Generation and Road Safety

The application material does not provide sufficient information regarding the expected volume, frequency or timing of vehicle movements associated with the proposed horticulture processing facility.

The original application lodged by Milford Planning on 2 April 2026 states that *“Access is achieved directly from Trent Road to the facility, with sufficient gravel hardstand available for truck manoeuvring. It is expected that the largest vehicle accessing the site will be a B-Double, although initially this may only consist of a small truck. No more than two delivery trucks are expected on any day (delivery of produce and pick up of dried product).”*

Council sought additional information regarding access arrangements in its Information Request dated 6 May 2026. The request sought clarity on the subject land parcels on which the access track is located, to confirm that all relevant titles are included in the application.

The Applicant’s response to the Information Request dated 11 May 2026 reiterated that there is to be no change to the access arrangements for the property, that the physical and lawful access arrangements for Lot 13 on SP250536 will not be affected by this proposal and that it is anticipated that the proposed use will have a lower traffic demand, and involve less traffic movements than the prior use of the facility as an aquaculture facility.

As part of the response and in accordance with Section 52 of the *Planning Act 2016*, a Change to the Development Application was made to include additional land parcels, Lots 12 and 14 on SP250536.

Based on information available via Queensland Globe, the access arrangement to the subject site is via a gravel track covered by various existing easements including:

- Easements AA, D, X and Z in Lot 13 on SP250536 on SP250536;
- Easements W and Y in Lot 14 on SP250536 on SP250536;
- Easement B in Lot 14 on SP250536 on RP749224; and
- Easement K in Lot 13 on SP250536 on RP735794.



No information has been provided on the terms of those existing easements or the subject land parcels benefiting from the easements, to make an informed assessment of the number of vehicles utilising the gravel road in addition to the number of vehicles proposed to utilise the gravel road.

The Planning Report identifies that the facility will expand to process up to 22 tonnes of produce per day, which is rationalised as the equivalent to 1 B-Double truck per day. For applications similar in nature (e.g. Council Ref MCU24/0009), Council have asked for a RPEQ certified assessment of the proposed traffic route from the Beach Road and Trent Road to the development site to demonstrate that the current road infrastructure is suitable to cater for a B-Double configuration. An assessment of this kind may include but not be limited to a pavement impact assessment and road geometry assessment neither of which have been provided with the application material.

It is further noted that the applicant's own assessment against the Flood Hazard Overlay Code concedes that *"parts of the access route will be within flood burdened areas"*. No assessment has been provided of the implications of a flood-affected, unsealed access route for pavement condition, ongoing maintenance or safe access during and following wet weather events.

In addition, no confirmation has been provided that Beach Road and Trent Road form part of an approved route for B-Double (restricted access vehicle) operation under the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator's network mapping. If they do not, the traffic task described in the application material cannot lawfully be undertaken as proposed.

Notwithstanding the absence of this information, an indicative quantification is possible from the application material itself. The Planning Report anticipates up to 10 employees (up to 20 light vehicle movements per day) and up to two delivery trucks per day (four heavy vehicle movements, ultimately in B-Double configuration), during a growing season of approximately 250 days per year. This equates to in the order of 20 to 24 vehicle movements per day past the submitter's dwelling on an unsealed track. The applicant's characterisation of the traffic task as minor is not supported by its own figures.

In particular, there is limited information regarding:

- seasonal fluctuations in traffic associated with surrounding harvesting and processing activities;
- employee vehicle numbers;
- hours of operation and peak traffic periods;
- expected use of the local road network; and
- whether any upgrades to the existing road infrastructure will be required.

Without a detailed Traffic Impact Assessment or equivalent analysis, it is difficult to determine whether the existing road network has sufficient capacity to safely accommodate the demand generated by the proposed use or whether mitigation measures will be required.

2. Dust Generation

The existing access road servicing the site is already subject to speeding vehicles and frequent dust generation, which adversely affects adjoining properties and road users. Any increase in vehicle movements, particularly heavy vehicles associated with the proposed horticulture processing facility, has the potential to exacerbate these existing



issues by increasing dust emissions, reducing visibility along the access road and creating greater conflict between agricultural machinery, heavy vehicles and other local traffic.

These impacts have the potential to adversely affect both the amenity of neighbouring properties and road safety.

Dust generated from vehicle movements is an established issue along the access road. However, the application material does not provide sufficient information to assess whether the proposed development will increase or adequately manage these impacts. While the Planning Report states that the proposed use is anticipated to generate fewer vehicle movements than the previous lawful use, it does not quantify the traffic generated by the former use, the traffic expected to be generated by the proposed development, or the basis upon which this conclusion has been reached.

Without this information, it is not possible to determine whether the proposed development will create significant dust impacts or whether existing impacts will be materially worsened.

Importantly, PO44 requires that development *does not create significant impacts* resulting from dust or the volume of traffic generated. In circumstances where dust is already an existing issue, the application should demonstrate, through appropriate technical assessment and operational detail, that the proposed use will not exacerbate those impacts or reduce the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring landowners.

No such assessment has been provided.

The only material in the application addressing dust is the applicant's response to PO44 which relies upon '*crushed gravel eliminating any unreasonable pluming*'. That response addresses only the hardstand area within the lease area. It does not address the extended length of unsealed access track between Trent Road and the facility, being the section of the rout adjacent to the residence and the location at which current dust impact actually occurs. It will be exacerbated by traffic from the proposal.

The absence of a dust impact assessment, traffic modelling or a Dust Management Plan means there is insufficient evidence for Council to conclude that the proposed development satisfies PO44. Nor does the application identify any enforceable mitigation measures, such as road sealing, dust suppression, vehicle speed management, road maintenance commitments or operational controls that would minimise dust emissions and influence behaviour, associated with the proposed use.

Given the existing dust impacts experienced by adjoining landowners, the application should provide a robust assessment of cumulative impacts rather than considering the proposed development in isolation. Without this information, there is insufficient certainty that the development will not create significant impacts as contemplated by PO44.

3. Insufficient Operational Detail

The application lacks sufficient operational detail to allow adjoining landowners or Council to properly assess the likely impacts of the proposal. Information that appears to be absent or insufficient includes:

- hours of operation;
- seasonal operating intensity;



- loading and unloading arrangements;
- internal vehicle circulation;
- waste handling procedures;
- storage areas;
- noise-generating equipment;
- outdoor operational activities; and
- management measures proposed to minimise impacts on adjoining properties.

The previous aquaculture use does not establish an appropriate benchmark against which to assess the proposed development unless the application demonstrates the nature and intensity of that former use and compares it with the proposed operation. Without information such as historical traffic volumes, hours of operation, processing intensity or environmental impacts, there is no evidentiary basis to conclude that the proposed horticulture processing facility will generate equivalent or lesser impacts.

Conclusion

Acknowledgement is made to the importance of supporting agricultural industries within the Burdekin region, however serious concern remains that the information submitted with the application does not adequately demonstrate that the proposed Horticultural Product Processing Facility can operate without causing unreasonable impacts on surrounding rural properties, particularly given cumulative impacts with associated surrounding facilities.

Given the matters outlined above, it is submitted that insufficient information has been provided to enable a full and proper assessment of the application. An RPEQ certified Traffic Impact Assessment, Dust Management Plan, and the operational detail identified in this submission must be supplied prior to determination.

Where technical assessment can demonstrate compliance with the Planning Scheme, appropriate conditions must then be imposed to minimise impacts on neighbouring properties. As a minimum, they would be expected to include:

- sealing of the access track from Trent Road to the facility or, at a minimum, for a distance of 200 metres either side of existing dwellings, prior to the commencement of the use;
- interim dust suppression measures, and preparation and implementation of a Dust Management Plan to Council's satisfaction prior to the commencement of the use;
- a Traffic Management Plan addressing vehicle speeds (including a maximum speed of 40 km/h past existing dwellings), signage and driver behaviour;
- restriction of heavy vehicle movements to daytime hours (e.g. 6:00am to 6:00pm);
- a maximum annual throughput of 5,500 tonnes, consistent with the application material, such that any intensification of the use requires further assessment and attention to further impacts;
- RPEQ-designed access works at the Trent Road intersection in accordance with the relevant Austroads and IPWEA-Q standards; and
- ongoing maintenance obligations for the access track for the life of the use.

Each of the above conditions bears a direct nexus to the impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding road network and adjoining residents. They are relevant and reasonable for the purposes of the *Planning Act 2016*.



We look forward to Council's consideration on the matters raised, and we would welcome the opportunity to speak with you to expand on this submission with you.

Yours faithfully,

Emma Staines

Town Planner

Brazier Motti Pty Ltd