

Contact details

Name	[REDACTED]
Organisation	<u>Tyabb & District Ratepayers, Business & Environment Group Inc.</u>
City/Town	<u>Tyabb</u>
State	<u>VIC</u>
Postcode	<u>3913</u>
Email Address	[REDACTED]@yahoo.com.au
Phone Number	[REDACTED]

I am making this submission on behalf of:

- Individual
- Non-government organisation / community organisation
- Business
- Local Government
- Other government entity
- Other (please specify)

Industry Activity or Scheduled Category (if applicable):

Noise emission from privately owned airfields in Victoria

Privacy Options - please select an option:

- I am making this submission as an individual and I understand that it may be published
- I am making this submission as an individual. I request my submission be published anonymously with my postcode but with no other details.
- This submission is being made by an organisation and I understand that it may be published, including the name of the organisation

The Current Regulations

These questions relate to the list of industry activities covered by the current Environment Protection (Scheduled Premises and Exemptions) Regulations 2007 as discussed in Section 3 of the Scheduled Premises Regulations Review [Discussion Paper](#).

For a full list of industry activities and their definitions, please refer to the current regulations [here](#).

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.

A01	PIW management	
A02	Other waste treatment	
A03	Sewage treatment	
A04	Industrial wastewater treatment	
A05	Landfills	
A06	Land disposal	
A07	Composting	
A08	Waste to energy	
A09	Waste tyre storage	
B01	Intensive animal industry	
B02	Livestock saleyards	
B03	Fish farms	
C01	Extractive industry and mining	
D01	Abattoirs	
D02	Rendering	
D03	Animal skin tanning	
D04	Seafood processing	
D05	Pet food processing	
D06	Food processing	
D07	Milk processing	
D08	Edible oil	

D09	Beverage manufacturing	
E01	Textiles	
F01	Timber preservation	
F02	Fibreboard	
F03	Paper pulp mills	
G01	Chemical works	
G02	Coal Processing	
G03	Oil and gas refining	
G04	Bulk Storage	
G05	Container Washing	
H01	Cement	
H02	Bitumen (asphalt) batching	
H03	Ceramics	
H04	Mineral wool	
H05	Glass works	
I01	Primary metallurgical	
I02	Metal melting	
I03	Metal galvanising	
I04	Metal finishing	
I05	Can and drum coating	
I06	Vehicle assembly	
J01	Printing	
K01	Power stations	
K02	Carbon geosequestration	
K03	Potable water treatment plants	
K04	Water desalination plants	
L01	General emissions to air	Noise Emissions at non Commonwealth airfields are currently not regulated and pose a risk to health
L02	Contaminated sites—onsite soil containment	
L03	Tunnel Ventilation Systems	
L04	Contaminated sites—long term management	

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.

A01	PIW management	
A02	Other waste treatment	
A03	Sewage treatment	
A04	Industrial wastewater treatment	
A05	Landfills	
A06	Land disposal	
A07	Composting	
A08	Waste to energy	
A09	Waste tyre storage	
B01	Intensive animal industry	
B02	Livestock saleyards	
B03	Fish farms	
C01	Extractive industry and mining	
D01	Abattoirs	
D02	Rendering	
D03	Animal skin tanning	
D04	Seafood processing	
D05	Pet food processing	
D06	Food processing	
D07	Milk processing	
D08	Edible oil	
D09	Beverage manufacturing	
E01	Textiles	
F01	Timber preservation	
F02	Fibreboard	
F03	Paper pulp mills	
G01	Chemical works	

G02	Coal Processing	
G03	Oil and gas refining	
G04	Bulk Storage	
G05	Container Washing	
H01	Cement	
H02	Bitumen (asphalt) batching	
H03	Ceramics	
H04	Mineral wool	
H05	Glass works	
I01	Primary metallurgical	
I02	Metal melting	
I03	Metal galvanising	
I04	Metal finishing	
I05	Can and drum coating	
I06	Vehicle assembly	
J01	Printing	
K01	Power stations	
K02	Carbon geosequestration	
K03	Potable water treatment plants	
K04	Water desalination plants	
L01	General emissions to air	
L02	Contaminated sites—onsite soil containment	
L03	Tunnel Ventilation Systems	
L04	Contaminated sites—long term management	

QUESTION 3:

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

Licensing of non-Commonwealth airfields. See separate documentation

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?

It is clearly demonstrated that where there are no controls emitters act unchecked due to lack of available enforcement. We see levels of unchecked noise that make land unsuitable for dwellings under the Australian Standards and there is no enforceable recourse to have the noise addressed.

Conversely, if there were emission controls at private airfields in Victoria a significant reduction of noise and other pollutants can be achieved by enforceable management.

Adapting to changes

The following questions relate to Section 4 of the Scheduled Premises Regulations Review [Discussion Paper](#), which discusses the need to ensure that the new scheduled premises regulations are as up-to-date and effective as possible, in light of recent and anticipated changes in Victoria’s population, economy, mix of industrial technologies etc.

Please see the [current regulations](#) for the full descriptions and application thresholds (requiring works approvals, licences or financial assurances) in the current regulations.

QUESTION 5:

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

Yes (If yes, go to Question 5A)

No (If no, go to Question 6)

QUESTION 5 A:

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?

A01	PIW management	
A02	Other waste treatment	
A03	Sewage treatment	
A04	Industrial wastewater treatment	
A05	Landfills	
A06	Land disposal	
A07	Composting	
A08	Waste to energy	
A09	Waste tyre storage	
B01	Intensive animal industry	
B02	Livestock saleyards	
B03	Fish farms	
C01	Extractive industry and mining	
D01	Abattoirs	
D02	Rendering	

D03	Animal skin tanning	
D04	Seafood processing	
D05	Pet food processing	
D06	Food processing	
D07	Milk processing	
D08	Edible oil	
D09	Beverage manufacturing	
E01	Textiles	
F01	Timber preservation	
F02	Fibreboard	
F03	Paper pulp mills	
G01	Chemical works	
G02	Coal Processing	
G03	Oil and gas refining	
G04	Bulk Storage	
G05	Container Washing	
H01	Cement	
H02	Bitumen (asphalt) batching	
H03	Ceramics	
H04	Mineral wool	
H05	Glass works	
I01	Primary metallurgical	
I02	Metal melting	
I03	Metal galvanising	
I04	Metal finishing	
I05	Can and drum coating	
I06	Vehicle assembly	
J01	Printing	
K01	Power stations	
K02	Carbon geosequestration	
K03	Potable water treatment plants	

K04	Water desalination plants	
L01	General emissions to air	There is a requirement to License noise emitters not captured under the SEPPS
L02	Contaminated sites—onsite soil containment	
L03	Tunnel Ventilation Systems	
L04	Contaminated sites—long term management	

Aside from the current activity-by-activity triggers for works approval or licence requirements, the current Scheduled Premises Regulations allow for a works approval or licence to be required for any activity with general emissions of certain substances to air over a set amount per year (see Category L01 – General emissions to air). Section 4 of the [Discussion Paper](#) introduces the idea that introducing more of these ‘emissions based triggers’ could increase the flexibility of the regulations in keeping pace with new industry activities.

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?

Yes

No

Please tell us why you think that an increased focus on emissions-based triggers would/would not make the Scheduled Premises Regulations more effective.

Using the new NASAF guidelines (as adopted by the Victoria Government), as a base, a license requirement should be triggered when the potential to exceed the base guidelines is indicated.

Section 4.1 of the Scheduled Premises Regulations Review Discussion Paper introduces some environmental challenges considered most relevant to this review.

QUESTION 7:

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

Yes (If yes, go to Question 8A)

No (If no, go to Question 7A)

QUESTION 7 A:

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

There is a need to address smaller sources but the reasons are not necessarily that there is a cumulative effect, particularly with noise, but more so that the intensity of noise from small (relatively) emitters can be significant and just as damaging.

Considering the environmental issues in section 4.1 of the [Discussion Paper](#), the following questions seek your input on whether works approvals, licences, financial assurances, or other tools are best suited to addressing them.

QUESTION 8 A:

Are works approvals a suitable tool to address the environmental challenges outlined in section 4.1 of the [Discussion Paper](#)?

- Yes (If yes, go to Question 8B)
- No (If no, go to Question 8D)

QUESTION 8 B:

Are licences a suitable tool to address the environmental challenges outlined in section 4.1 of the [Discussion Paper](#)?

- Yes (If yes, go to Question 8C)
- No (If no, go to Question 8D)

QUESTION 8 C:

Are financial assurances a suitable tool to address the environmental challenges outlined in section 4.1 of the [Discussion Paper](#)?

- Yes (If yes, go to Question 9A)
- No (If no, go to Question 8D)

QUESTION 8D:

What other tool(s) would be more suitable than works approvals, licenses and/or financial assurances to address the environmental challenges outlined in section 4.1 of the [Discussion Paper](#)? Why?

New Elements being considered

Section 5 of the Scheduled Premises Regulations Review [Discussion Paper](#) describes some potential new components which could be introduced into the Scheduled Premises Regulations and EPA's administrative processes which sit behind them, in order to meet the challenges of modern regulation.

Section 5.1 introduces the concept of tiered licence conditions, applied depending on a site's individual risk profile.

Section 5.2 introduces the concept of a licence fee component that reflects EPA's likely regulatory effort at each site.

QUESTION 9 A:

Would tiered licence conditions, applied depending on a site's individual risk profile, be worthwhile?

Yes

No

Please tell us why.

A tiered structure would allow wide flexibility that would enable regular reviews and adjustments. i.e if standards improve or slip the emitter could be moved around within the structure without the need to re-apply for licenses.

QUESTION 9 B:

Would a site-based licence fee component, reflecting EPA's regulatory effort at each site, be worthwhile?

Yes No

Please tell us why.

Follows the user pays principle. Those that require bigger input from regulators pay more. Those that take it upon themselves to self-improve or monitor (subject to approved auditing) pay less. Monetary penalties are a good incentive to change.

QUESTION 10:

Please tell us if you think there are any components of the Scheduled Premises Regulations or Fees Regulations, or how they are applied by EPA, which could be improved.

QUESTION 11:

Do you have any concerns with how current processes for managing scheduled premises are operating?

Yes (If yes, go to Question 11A)

No (If no, go to Question 12)

QUESTION 11 A:

What are your concerns with how current processes for managing scheduled premises are operating, and how might these concerns be effectively addressed?

Refer to separate documentation. Any venue / premises that is an emitter and is not captured under other regulations needs to become a scheduled premise or simply a licensed premise and the onus of all enforcement should fall to the EPA. Councils continually fail to enforce for a variety of reasons. There is a need for clear, unambiguous and enforceable licenses on emitters

QUESTION 12:

Are there any other key points you would like to make?

Please see accompanying 'Submission to EPA Scheduled Premises Regulations Review', November 2015

Please return written submissions by 14 December 2015 to:

Email: scheduled.premises@epa.vic.gov.au

Mail:

Scheduled Premises Regulations Review
c/o- Policy and Regulation Unit
EPA Victoria
GPO 4395
Melbourne VIC 3001