

#17



COMPLETE

Collector: Web L nk (Web L nk)
Started: Wednesday, November 11, 2015 11:05:49 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, November 11, 2015 11:46:26 AM
Time Spent: 00:40:37
IP Address: [REDACTED]

PAGE 2

Q1: Contact details

Name [REDACTED]
City/Town Mitcham
State Vic
Postcode 3132
Email Address [REDACTED]
Phone Number [REDACTED]

Q2: I am making this submission on behalf of: Individual

Q3: Industry Activity or Scheduled Category (if applicable): refuse transfer

Q4: Privacy Options - please select an option: I am making this submission as an individual. I request my submission be published anonymously with my postcode but with no other details.

PAGE 3: Current Regulations

Q5: Question 1: Which of the following currently scheduled categories or industrial activities are the most important for EPA works approval, licensing, and/or financial assurance requirements? For each of the activities you regard as most important, please tell us why in the box provided.

A02 - Other waste treatment Refuse transfer stations as they have been a nuisance for a decade
A09 - Waste tyre storage Fires have occurred in a refuse transfer station we had here
L02 - Contaminated sites—onsite soil containment Sites with asbestos

PAGE 4

Q6: Question 2: What currently scheduled categories or industrial activities might no longer warrant EPA works approval, licensing, and/or financial assurance requirements? For each of the activities you regard as longer warranting requirements, please tell us which risks have been reduced and how in the box provided. *Respondent skipped this question*

PAGE 5

Q7: Question 3: What other industrial activities, not included in the current regulations, might warrant works approval, licensing, and/or financial assurance requirements and why?

Nuisance large machines in refuse transfer stations must have some sort of shield so cant hear in a residential zone.

Q8: Question 4: What would happen to emission levels, the numbers of pollution events, and the management of wastes if there were no EPA works approvals or licence requirements in Victoria? Why?

People lives would be hell living near noise and fumes (like ours have been for 10 years).

PAGE 6: Adapting to changes

Q9: Question 5: Do any of the descriptions and application thresholds for currently scheduled categories need to be changed or clarified?

Yes

Q10: Please indicate which definitions or application thresholds need to be changed or clarified for industrial activities in the list below. For the activities, please tell us in detail for each activity, what specific changes or clarifications could be required?

A02 - Other waste treatment

300 metres minimum for refuse transfer. Planning has this at 30 metres

A05 - Landfill operations

0) made with consultation with the EPA should have fixed minimum thresholds.

A06 - Land disposal of night oil, septic tank and sewage sludge

As above - Make appropriate minimum thresholds for all sections in section 52.10 of planning so a new officer cannot make errors and consider that something close to a residential zone is suitable when it has been a bother for 10 years.

A07 - Composting

As above

PAGE 7

Q11: Question 6: Would an increased focus on emissions-based triggers for works approval or licence requirements, regardless of the activity creating these emissions, make the Scheduled Premises regulations more effective?

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 8

Q12: Question 7: Do you agree that the environmental challenges outlined in section 4.1 are the most relevant ones for this review?

Respondent skipped this question

Q13: Please tell us what other environmental challenges relating to industrial activities should be considered? Why?

I am fed up with complaining about noise from a refuse transfer station that has been placed far too close to a residential zone (about 74 metres). they use large machines and drop heavy loads and should be far further away. Stationary large machines have been a big nuisance and should be stopped or have a works notice so they put something like a freeway wall to stop the noise

Q14: Question 8: Are works approvals a suitable tool to address the environmental challenges outlined above? Yes

Q15: What other tool would be more suitable than works approvals to address these environmental challenges? Why?

Either a works approval notice or get them off the land to a more suitable location

Q16: Are licences a suitable tool to address the environmental challenges outlined above? Yes

Q17: What other tool would be more suitable than licences to address these environmental challenges? Why?

finer for breaches. Removal if not complying

Q18: Are financial assurances a suitable tool to address the environmental challenges outlined above? Yes

Q19: What other tool would be more suitable than financial assurances to address these environmental challenges? Why?

I dont really know what it means and the computer indicates I must answer

Q20: Question 9: Would tiered licence conditions, applied depending on a site's individual risk profile be worthwhile? *Respondent skipped this question*

Q21: Please tell us why you consider that tiered licence conditions would be worthwhile. *Respondent skipped this question*

Q22: Please tell us why you consider that tiered licence conditions would not be worthwhile. *Respondent skipped this question*

Q23: Would a site-based licence fee component, reflecting EPA's regulatory effort at each site, be worthwhile? *Respondent skipped this question*

Q24: Please tell us why you consider that a site-based licence fee component would be worthwhile. *Respondent skipped this question*

Q25: Please tell us why you consider that site-based licence fee component would not be worthwhile. *Respondent skipped this question*

Q26: Question 10: Please tell us if you think there are any components of the Scheduled Premises regulations, or how they are applied by EPA, which could be improved. *Respondent skipped this question*

Q27: Question 11: Do you have any concerns with how current processes for managing scheduled premises are operating? *Respondent skipped this question*

Q28: What are your concerns with how current processes for managing scheduled premises are operating, and how might these concerns be effectively addressed? *Respondent skipped this question*

Q29: Question 12: Are there any other key points you would like to make?

There should have been tight regulations and effective action taken so we did not have to complain repeatedly and frequently at times over the last 10 years. The EPA states their threshold for refuse transfer is 200 metres (reduced from 300 metres) and yet state planning has totally ignored this and allowed refuse transfer to be 30 metres from a residential zone. Planning blamed the EPA and stated no it is up to the EPA to get nuisance refuse transfer off the land and even local council has no authority. A suitably located industry , business etc has rare complaints if any. The EPA should clean up clause 52.10 of the planning scheme so all categories have suitable minimum thresholds.
