

EPA Victoria GPO Box 4395 Melbourne Victoria 3001

Greater Shepparton City Council Locked Bag 1000 Shepparton VIC, 3632

[REDACTED]

26.9.19

To whom it may concern;

Comments on Section 22(1) notice to provide further information by Meatworks Australia Pty Ltd - development at 630 Lancaster -Mooroopna Rd. Gillieston & 1100 Mulcahy Rd, Gillieston.

EPA Work's Approval Application: 1003441

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the information provided by Meatworks P/L (Meatworks) in their Section 22(1) response published 29th August on the EPA Engage website. We provide the following comments:

We start by expressing frustration and disappointment that impacted residents were initially given only 7 days to reply to Meatworks Australia section 22 reply- this was an unreasonable restriction of time and given that members of our community were away, or held up with work- we felt it unfair to those wanting to reply.

We are grateful the EPA decided to extend this deadline, but this was only after multiple emails and us requesting a fairer timeline.

We also share frustration with EPA and the council having a joint application that allowed a streamlined process for Meatworks Australia but yet allows them to pick and choose what they reply to in the section 22 reply.

We should be able to reply to anything they have put into their application and section 22 reply and those should be addressed by meatworks Australia. It is not a fair process to have one application process for meatworks Australia but enable them to dismiss our issues.

We will be sending our concerns to both the EPA and council for consideration.

1. Separation distance

Our home at [REDACTED] is claimed to be a distance of 520m from Meatworks Australia's sheep overflow yards

We do not accept this measurement as accurate as the EPA IRAE guideline 1580 method 2 states: 8.2 Method 2 - Method 2 measures the separation distance from the activity boundary of the industry to the activity boundary of the sensitive land use, as illustrated in figure 3. The activity boundary of the sensitive land use is the area (within a convex polygon) that includes all current or proposed sensitive uses (including residences, garages and carports, BBQ areas, clotheslines and swimming pools). Method 2 should be applied where the nearest sensitive land use is both: • not in an urban area or township • on a site at least 0.4 hectares, or in a zone requiring subdivisions to be at least 0.4 hectares. Irrespective, where off-site effects may be experienced, the industry producing any IRAEs should be separated as far as possible from the nearest sensitive land use.

This is not an accurate measurement as our area of sensitivity would be our clothesline.

We would like this reviewed.

2. MINERS REST EXAMPLE

We are aware of a similar works and planning application that went ahead with the Miners rest saleyard project. Having direct conversations with impacted residents we are aware of seriously large numbers of EPA complaints surrounding odour.

We believe the application has not addressed this concern and request this is considered as it will significantly impact our liability and amenity.

<https://www.thecourier.com.au/story/5805653/big-stink-over-new-miners-rest-saleyards/>

We are not happy with the odour modelling or being told we will not be affected by odour.

3. Meatworks Australia has not addressed the 'social issues' that have been lumped into one category- then advised they will not address these. After discussions with the community's major internet and mobile phone reception provider we have been informed our connections will be significantly impacted and jeopardised. This is due to the closest tower being at Udera is 3G and is at maximum capacity currently. Large numbers of staff connecting to this tower will put our connection at risk jeopardising our mobile and business/home connections. This may not be an EPA issue, but it is an issue that needs addressing!
4. We find it absurd Meatworks Australia can dismiss the concern of the health of its workers and our community and surrounding area. Mental health in the GV is a serious issue.
5. Meatworks Australia has not addressed how they will manage or mitigate the issue of flies. We would like further information about this.
6. Meatworks Australia provides proposed health mitigation that targets workers of the business such as screening and Qfever vaccinations. We as the community are not protected from these risks and our children are at serious risk of contracting such zoonotic diseases without being able to be vaccinated. Qfever is a serious and common issue in such large numbers of stock- meatworks Australia claim they will be processing only lambs- we do not believe this. There is no stipulation that they have to adhere to only processing lambs- therefore their claims that lambs do not pose a Qfever risk are irrelevant- they will be processing animals that DO pose a risk.

Meatworks Australia have stated 'Only healthy lambs free of infectious diseases will be brought to the meatworks' this cannot be assured as many infectious diseases cannot be detected for some time.

7. EPA does not have any specific environmental public health guidance for animal disease management for meatworks operations.
8. EPA does not have any specific environmental public health guidance for WAA's.
9. Meatworks Australia is unfairly restricting residence with what we can do with our own land.

Conclusion In summary we continue to consider this proposal / application poses significant risks to neighbouring landholders and residents and while the Meatworks section 22(1) has addressed some of our concerns others have not been addressed.

We request the EPA and Council again consider our standpoint as a ratepaying and established rural community and make the decision based on the value of our community and children's health, our ability to continue running local farms and live the lifestyle the GSCC is responsible for protecting.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]