

5 February, 2016

Enquiries: Ken Chan
Reference: OUT16/92042F8

Mr Nick Wimbush
Advisory Committee Chair
Major Hazard Facilities Advisory Committee

By electronic submission

Dear Mr Wimbush

Re: Major Hazard Facilities - Discussion paper

I am writing in response to your letter dated December 22, 2015 regarding the abovementioned matter.

Wodonga City Council commend the committee for its work on how risks and amenity around Major Hazard Facilities (MHF) could be better managed and for seeking feedback from council on the discussion paper.

By providing the following comments, council would like to note that Wodonga does not have any current MHF installation in the municipalities.

Due to the time lines to respond to the discussion paper, the following submission has not yet been endorsed by the Wodonga City Council and as such is an officer only submission at this stage.

Feedback on the discussion paper:

- *Clause 13.04-2 Environmental Risk: Air Quality* – Council’s experience to date on this clause is the controls provided are not sufficient as a result additional problems arise and the issue remains, an relevant example is related to an organic recycling facility. Potential improvements include providing a definition for MHF and setting up corresponding buffer distance requirements (see comments on Thought starters 2 and 4 below).
- *Clause 19.03-5 Strategy to ensure buffers for waste and resource recovery facilities are defined, protected and maintained* – council agree with the strategy as recent examples have revealed that poorly managed storage of waste/ recycling materials can become a major health risk or adverse amenity to nearby developments.
- *Thought starter 2 The role of planning to address areas surrounding MHF* - Council consider a mechanism should be built into planning schemes that helps avoiding land uses conflicts between sensitive uses and facilities that have potential adverse amenity impacts when there are changes to buffer zones requirements or other restrictions. There are



examples that when changes to buffer zone requirements occur, uses that were originally permitted become inappropriate under new requirements and this causes conflicts. These conflicts could be avoided if they were considered as part of the regulation change, or if some sort of existing use rights mechanism applies.

- *Thought starter 4 Defining MHF in planning schemes* – it will be important to include a definition for MHF in the planning scheme in order to enable the formulation the extent of risk areas or buffer zones for sensitive uses from MHF.
- *Thought starter 5 MHF emergency plans* – Council consider that MHF emergency plans should most certainly be required to consider the affect of a major incident and provide the information to the local community.
- *Thought starter 9 Modelled risk areas around MHF* – council agree this should be translated into planning schemes, which could be applied in the forms of requirements for an emergency response plan, or development requirements (such as mitigation measures or buffer distances) for different uses surrounding MHF.
- *Thought starter 29 'Agent of change' principle* – council agree this should be introduced to planning schemes.
- *Thought starter 31 Develop a Planning Practice Notes for interface planning* – this is considered useful which could provide guidance for planning practitioners or planning authorities when planning uses around MHF.

Wodonga City Council appreciate the opportunity to provide input into the discussion paper and would appreciate if council could be provided with further update in the future on the subsequent stages of the process.

If you have any enquiries concerning this letter please contact Ken Chan, Acting Team Leading Strategic Planning on 02-60229300 or kchan@wodonga.vic.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



John Sidgwick
Manager Planning and Building