



**GAS IMPORT JETTY AND PIPELINE PROJECT  
ENVIRONMENT EFFECTS STATEMENT  
INQUIRY AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**TECHNICAL NOTE**

**TECHNICAL NOTE NUMBER:** TN 047

**DATE:** 29 October 2020

**LOCATION:** Pipeline Works

**EES/MAP BOOK REFERENCE:** N/A

**SUBJECT:** Response to matters raised in Tabled Document #188, Technical Advice #2, prepared by IAC Member, Ms Sarah Auld

**SUMMARY** Further information regarding pipeline classification and notification issues.

**REQUEST:** Questions set out below.

**NOTE:**

**1.1 Location Class**

**Query: Considering the foreseeable growth of Hastings as a major activity centre, provide further explanation as to why a T1(S) class has been assigned and not a T2 location class.**

1. Terminology and concepts within the Victorian Planning Framework do not directly translate to land use classification identified within AS2885. There are many examples of this including land use definitions themselves as has been highlighted in Technical Note 4.
2. A 'major activity centre' doesn't automatically translate to the description of a T2 land use classification in As2885AS/NZS2885.6:2018.
3. In the same fashion, the commercial, retail and community uses in themselves don't automatically invoke a certain land use classification under the AS2885 simply by their existence. Their existence is considered as part of the broader ML.
4. In identifying reasonably foreseeable land uses within the Measurement Length, it is necessary to understand what the likely outcomes are, no matter how that environment is labelled in other documents or frameworks.
5. The Hastings Town Centre Structure Plan 2017 as referenced within the Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme sets out the extent of the activity centre. In regards to ML with a radius of 640 metres it makes up a portion of that Measurement Length area, but is not the dominant one. Further, the Structure Plan itself refers to residential development of typical housing up to two stories and development within the commercial centre up to 3 storeys, with potential residential above commercial. This is not 'high density' development for the purposes of a 'T2' land use class, which is more applicable to a major centre such as Chadstone Shopping Centre, Eastland or Southland.
6. The classification of T1 through Hastings is therefore appropriate having regard to:

- a. consideration of the full extent of land within the ML and the fact that the 'Town Centre' is not the majority of land at any point; and
  - b. the density and type of development facilitated by the structure plan within its boundaries.
7. It is noted that T1(S) is in fact the same design standard as T2.

## 1.2 Sensitive Uses

### Queries:

- **What is the basis on which higher density residential use is included in the APA's list of land uses that they have an ongoing interest in?**
  - **Are there other uses as defined by the Victoria Planning Provisions that should be included in the list of uses that require consideration on a case by case basis, such as Earth and Energy Resources, Fuel Depot or Major Sports and Recreation Facility?**
8. Higher density residential use is included in the APA's list of land uses in which APA have an ongoing interest because higher density residential use (above 50 dwellings per hectare) is identified in AS2885 as a trigger in land use change from T1 to T2, which subsequently triggers an SMS and review of the risk profile of the pipeline.
9. The list of land uses designated as being of interest does vary slightly in different contexts. This is a result of a variety of factors including: consideration of likely uses in an area (that is, the list is customised to context), negotiations between APA and stakeholders in relation to planning scheme amendments, revisions during Panel recommendations, there sometimes being different ways of addressing the same land uses, and an ongoing discussion about how best to identify higher density accommodation.
10. APA's view is that it would be best to have an accepted, consistent list of uses requiring referral to Energy Safe Victoria, as discussed below. In the meantime, a degree of variation is an inevitable result of there being no mandated approach to the identification and protection of pipelines.
11. APA considers the list of land uses provided in Technical Note 4 for case-by-case consideration to be appropriate and to capture the uses in which APA is likely to have an interest. As discussed below, there are proposals, supported by APA, for an overlay to identify pipelines and ensure notification of uses to ESV, as pipeline safety regulator. That overlay may specify different uses.

## 1.3 Notification Area

### Query: Confirm how the 50 metres either side of the pipeline has been derived

12. The determination of the area of consequence is based on the impact from credible threats as detailed in the SMS (document 96). The SMS showed that the worst case credible threat to the pipeline was a 25 tonne excavator with 'Tiger teeth' striking the pipeline of wall thickness 10.41mm. The result of this impact is determined through calculation in accordance with AS 2885.6:2018. That calculation shows the impact would create a loss of containment equivalent to 0.49GJ/s as stated in Appendix A of the SMS.

13. Appendix A includes a table of radiation contours from various sized energy releases for information purposes only. The table shows an energy release rate of 0.48 GJ/s creates a heat contour of 4.7 kW/m<sup>2</sup> of 45m. The credible release rate of 0.49GJ/s would create a heat contour marginally greater than 45m and thus the basis for the 50m consequence area of concern.

#### **1.4 Notification Mechanism**

**Query: What is the mechanism or control by which the APA will receive notice of applications for sensitive uses?**

14. There is currently no formal mechanism by which the APA will receive notice of applications for sensitive uses.
15. APA regularly engages with councils and other stakeholders and landowners in the areas of its pipelines to seek to be informed of any relevant permit or planning scheme amendments. The Australian Pipeline Database has a record of all pipelines in the form of a GIS mapping tool and the database is made available for Councils and the Victoria Planning Authority for Greenfields areas.
16. APA is aware that ESV, as the lead safety regulator for pipelines, is developing a proposal for an overlay to identify pipelines and to require formal referral to Energy Safe Victoria as a Referral Authority of sensitive uses. APA has actively participated in that process. While APA's position has been that it would like to be a Referral Authority as the pipeline operator, it is understood that the preference by DELWP is to have a public authority rather than a private entity as the relevant Referral Authority. APA therefore supports ESV being designated as the relevant Referral Authority. The latest update provided to APA was a draft planning control was subject of consideration within DELWP.
17. APA therefore hopes that a mechanism or control by which APA will receive notice (from ESV) of applications for sensitive uses that are referred to ESV will be forthcoming in the future.

#### **1.5 Planning Policy Framework**

**Query: How does the proposal respond to the strategy at Clause 19.02-3S to recognise transmission-pressure gas pipelines in planning schemes?**

18. The current proposal does not seek a Planning Scheme Amendment to recognise this Pipeline in the applicable Planning Schemes.
19. At this time, there is not considered to be an existing 'off the shelf' overlay within the existing planning framework that is a fit for purpose vehicle to implement pipeline specific controls. As per 1.4 above, APA and the broader pipeline industry is pursuing a pipeline specific planning control. APA has participated in industry discussions regarding this pipeline overlay proposal and is supportive of the proposal.
20. APA does consider it appropriate that Cardinia Planning Scheme Amendment C234, implementing the Pakenham East Precinct Structure Plan, include notification requirements for defined sensitive uses within 50 metres of the proposed pipeline. These provisions would replicate those already proposed in the Amendment in relation to the existing APA pipeline that runs east-west through the PSP. These provisions are becoming standard in greenfield precinct structure plans. APA's view is that the only reason that they have not been included



in the Amendment is that the Project and the PSP have been under development at the same time, and that it would be appropriate to, in effect, update the Amendment.

21. Should the IAC recommend that an overlay be applied to the area of consequence along the Pipeline, APA would welcome this outcome.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** Nil.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Nil.