9 February 2016

Nick Wimbush
Major Hazard Facilities Advisory Committee
Planning Panels Victoria
Level 5, 1 Spring Street
Melbourne VIC 3000

Dear Mr Wimbush

Major Hazard Facilities Advisory Committee

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the Major Hazard Facilities Advisory Committee.

Major Hazard Facilities (MHF) play an important role in Victoria and metropolitan Melbourne, however in some cases their historic location and surrounding land use can be problematic. The need to improve land use planning for areas surrounding MHFs is supported.

The following comments in the committee's report are supported:

- Formal definition of terms, including Major Hazard Facility and Sensitive Use.
- Establishment of a clearer and more formal role for outside authorities, such as WorkSafe.
- The use of WorkSafe methodology for an inner and outer planning areas approach, where certain activities are considered inappropriate within proximity to a MHF.
- State Government developing a practice note or ministerial direction to present a unified approach to planning considerations around MHF (similar to the practice note for potentially contaminated land).
- Establishment of 'reverse buffers' to major hazard facilities to ensure their long-term viability and avoid increasing risk exposure to new uses.
- Identifying the location of existing licensed pipelines in planning schemes.
- Development of policy or additional planning provisions for land use planning around licensed pipelines, with the view to implementing Clause 19.03-6.

We make the following additional comments and suggestions:

- State Government-led planning controls are supported, whilst requesting an opportunity to include local strategic context and information.
• Consider establishing a single referral authority under Clause 66 of Victorian Planning Provisions.

• Clause 52.10 and EPA's Industrial Residual Air Emissions guidelines should be updated and include practical assessment criteria in the Victorian Planning Provisions.

• Safety protection and buffer distances should be proportional to the risk of the facility and be reflected in Clause 52.10, with specific criteria to consider varying buffer distances as appropriate.

• For gas pipelines, a holistic State Government approach is required for managing pipeline risk for areas likely to intensify, such as activity centres. Due to the linear nature of pipelines, a comprehensive safety assessment would improve decision making, while reducing uncertainty and administrative burden.

For specific changes to the planning system, we request consideration of the impact these changes will have on councils and local communities surrounding MHFs.

Further we welcome the opportunity to comment on specific changes to the planning provisions.

If you have any further queries in relation to this matter please contact Council's Manager City Strategy, Adrian Havrylyuk, on 9688 0389.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
Nigel Higgins
Director Planning Services