



## Environmental Protection Authority

Mr Mike Archer  
Chief Executive Officer  
City of Busselton  
Locked Bag 1  
**BUSSELTON WA 6280**

Our Ref: CMS16114: AC01-2016-0051  
Enquiries: Amy Sgherza, 6145 0818  
Email: amy.sgherza@epa.wa.gov.au

Attention: Ms Jennifer May

Dear Mr Archer

### **Busselton Margaret River Airport expansion – Assessment No: 2105**

The Environmental Scoping Document (ESD) (16 February 2017) specifying the scope and content of the Environmental Review Document (ERD) for the above proposal was considered by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) at Meeting No. 1098 on 16 February 2017. The ESD has been approved as providing an acceptable basis for the preparation of the ERD.

The EPA requires that the ERD is prepared in accordance with the EPA's *Instructions and Template: Environmental Review Document* which is available on the EPA's website [www.epa.wa.gov.au](http://www.epa.wa.gov.au).

During the preparation of the ERD you are encouraged to consult with the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority assessment officer for the proposal, Amy Sgherza, who can be contacted on telephone number 6145 0818. Please quote the above "Our Ref" on any further correspondence.

Yours sincerely

**Dr Tom Hatton**  
CHAIRMAN

2 March 2017

## ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING DOCUMENT

<b>Proposal name:</b>	<b>Busselton Margaret River Regional Airport Expansion</b>
<b>Proponent:</b>	<b>City of Busselton</b>
<b>Assessment number:</b>	<b>2105</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Lot 9001 (383) Vasse Highway, Yalyalup</b>
<b>Local Government Area:</b>	<b>City of Busselton</b>
<b>Public review period:</b>	<b>Environmental Review Document – 6 weeks</b>
<b>EPBC reference no:</b>	<b>2016/7675 Not a Controlled Action</b>

### 1. Introduction

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) has determined that the above proposal is to be assessed under Part IV of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act) by way of a Public Environmental Review (PER) level of assessment.

The purpose of the Environmental Scoping Document (ESD) is to define the form, content, timing and procedure of the environmental review, required by s. 40(3) of the EP Act. This ESD has been prepared by the EPA in consultation with the proponent consistent with the EPA's *Procedures Manual*.

#### **Form**

The EPA requires that the form of the report on the environmental review required under s. 40 (Environmental Review Document, ERD) is according to the [Environmental Review Document template](#).

#### **Content**

The EPA requires that the environmental review includes the content outlined in sections 2 to 6 of this ESD.

#### **Timing**

Table 1 sets out the timeline for the assessment of the proposal agreed between the EPA and the proponent.

**Table 1** Assessment timeline

Key assessment milestones	Completion Date
EPA approves Environmental Scoping Document	16 February 2017
Proponent submits first draft Environmental Review Document	31 March 2017
EPA provides comment on first draft Environmental Review Document <i>(6 weeks from receipt of ERD)</i>	8 May 2017
Proponent submits revised draft Environmental Review Document	22 May 2017
EPA authorises release of Environmental Review Document for public review <i>(2 weeks from EPA approval of ERD)</i>	29 June 2017
Proponent releases Environmental Review Document for public review for 6 weeks	3 July 2017
Close of public review period	14 August 2017
EPA provides Summary of Submissions <i>(3 weeks from close of public review period)</i>	4 September 2017
Proponent provides Response to Submissions	25 September 2017
EPA reviews the Response to Submissions <i>(4 weeks from receipt of Response to Submissions)</i>	23 October 2017
EPA prepares draft assessment report and completes assessment <i>(7 weeks from EPA accepting Response to Submissions)</i>	14 December 2017
EPA finalises assessment report (including two weeks consultation on draft conditions) and gives report to Minister <i>(6 weeks from completion of assessment)</i>	22 January 2018

**Procedure**

The EPA requires the proponent to undertake the environmental review according to the procedures in the *Administrative Procedures* and the *Procedures Manual*, including requirements for public review.

This draft ESD has not been released for public review. The ESD will be available on the EPA website ([www.epa.wa.gov.au](http://www.epa.wa.gov.au)) upon endorsement and must be appended to the PER document.

## 2. The proposal

The subject of this ESD is the proposal by the City of Busselton to modify the existing Busselton Margaret River Regional Airport operations to:

- allow additional aircraft types and operator aircraft types to use the airport; and
- change the hours of operation.

The regional location of the proposal is shown in Figure 1 and the development envelope encompassing the airport is shown in Figure 2.

A summary of the proposal is set out in Table 2. The PER will provide a more detailed description of the proposal by way of a key proposal characteristics table consistent with the EPA's *EIA Procedures Manual 2016* and *Instructions: Defining the proposal key characteristics*.

**Table 2 Summary of the proposal**

<b>Proposal title</b>	Busselton Margaret River Regional Airport
<b>Proponent name</b>	City of Busselton
<b>Short description</b>	The proposal is to operate a regional airport at Lot 9001 (383) Vasse Highway, Yalyalup.
<b>Runway heading</b>	30°/210°

### Existing proposal

The City of Busselton currently has approval under the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* to operate the Busselton Regional Airport subject to a Noise Management Plan which regulates the number and timing of flights. The assessment of the proposal therefore needs to have regard to the existing environmental approval.

Ministerial Statements which are relevant to the proposal are 399, 825, 856, 878, 887, 901 and 1009. These statements reflect a series of changes to both the conditions and the characteristics of the proposal. Ministerial Statements 901 and 1009 supersede all previous statements.

Ministerial Statement 1009 requires the implementation of a Noise Management Plan (January 2015) which includes aircraft noise restrictions, standard hours of operations, flight training guidelines, land use planning and Fly Neighbourly principles, a complaints process, and provisions for noise amelioration for affected residences.

### 3. Preliminary key environmental factors and required work

The preliminary key environmental factor for the environmental review is:

1. Social Surroundings

Table 3 outlines the work required for each preliminary key environmental factor and contains the following elements for each factor:

- **EPA factor** and **EPA objective** for that factor.
- **Relevant activities** – the proposal activities that may have a significant impact on that factor.
- **Potential impacts and risks** to that factor.
- **Required work** for that factor.
- **Relevant policy and guidance** – EPA (and other) guidance and policy relevant to the assessment.

**Table 3 Preliminary key environmental factor and required work**

Social Surroundings	
<b>EPA objective</b>	<i>To protect social surroundings from significant harm.</i>
<b>Relevant activities</b>	The proposal includes changes to the timing, and increase in the number, of aircraft at the airport.
<b>Potential impacts and risks</b>	Noise emissions from aircraft has the potential to impact on social surroundings, including amenity of people.  Implementation of the proposal may unreasonably interfere with the health, welfare, convenience and comfort of people from changes to the timing and number of aircraft movements, particularly at night time.
<b>Required work</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discuss the application of the mitigation hierarchy to avoid or minimise impacts on social surroundings, where possible.</li> <li>2. Identify all aspects of the proposal that are likely to have an impact on social surroundings.</li> <li>3. Discuss noise 'acceptability' criteria that typically apply to this type of airport, having regard to any relevant legislation, standards and guidelines. This may include having regard to similar airports operating in other jurisdictions.</li> <li>4. Undertake analysis and modelling of noise emissions (existing operations combined with proposed operations) to predict the extent, severity and duration of impacts on social surroundings, particularly on</li> </ol>

	<p>the amenity of surrounding residents, against noise criteria discussed in 3. In predicting impacts of the proposal, clearly differentiate between current and future noise impacts from the proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Show the current and forecast aircraft noise contours, identified from 4, superimposed over a map of residents and sensitive receptors.</li> <li>6. Clearly show and explain all assumptions and inputs used in the analysis and modelling and demonstrate why the assumptions and inputs used are realistic and reasonable for this proposal.</li> <li>7. Discuss the level of confidence in the predicted impacts to amenity including the risk should those predictions be incorrect.</li> <li>8. Present and explain the predicted impacts of the proposal in a way that can be understood by the layperson. (People likely to be affected by the proposal need to understand the likely outcomes of the proposal on social surrounds with a particular focus on amenity).</li> <li>9. Discuss how assumptions and parameters used in the modelling would be monitored and managed during the implementation of the proposal. For example, to what extent could flight paths and flight numbers used in the modelling in 4, be monitored and managed by the proponent.</li> <li>10. Propose management, mitigation and contingency measures to cover all operational aspects of the proposal identified in 2 that are technically and practically feasible. This should be set out in a draft revised Noise Management Plan and shall be included in the PER document.</li> <li>11. Describe planning and land use control measures to maintain buffers to prevent encroachment of sensitive land uses near the proposal and minimise amenity impacts in the future.</li> <li>12. Based on the above discuss how the proposal meets the EPA’s objectives for Social Surroundings.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Relevant policy and guidance</b></p>	<p><b><i>EPA Policy and Guidance</i></b>                  Environmental Factor Guideline: Social Surroundings</p> <p><b><i>Other policy and guidance</i></b>                  AS2021:2015: Acoustics – Aircraft and noise intrusion – Building siting and construction.</p>
<p><b>Peer Review</b></p>	<p>Commission, in consultation with the OEPA, a peer review of the assumptions and parameters used in the noise emissions modelling and the predicted impacts.</p>

#### 4. Other environmental factors or matters

The EPA has identified the following other environmental factor relevant to the proposal that must be addressed during the environmental review and discussed in the ERD using existing knowledge and information about the operational aspects of the proposal and distribution and ecology of waterbirds:

1. Terrestrial Fauna – (Waterbirds).

It is also important that the proponent be aware that other factors or matters may be identified during the course of the environmental review that were not apparent at the time that this ESD was prepared. If this situation arises, the proponent must consult with the EPA to determine whether these factors and/or matters are to be addressed in the ERD, and if so, to what extent.

#### 5. Stakeholder consultation

The proponent must consult with stakeholders who are affected by, or are interested in the proposal. This includes the decision-making authorities (see section 6), other relevant state government agencies and local government authorities, the local community and environmental non-government organisations. This includes consultation with Air Services Australia and CASA and ongoing consultation with the Busselton Regional Airport BMRA Consultative Group.

The proponent must document the following in the ERD:

- identified stakeholders;
- the stakeholder consultation undertaken to date and the outcomes, including decision-making authorities' specific regulatory approvals and any adjustments to the proposal as a result of consultation; and
- any future plans for consultation.

#### 6. Decision-making authorities

At this stage, the EPA has identified the authorities listed in Table 4 as decision-making authorities (DMAs) for the proposal. Additional DMAs may be identified during the course of the assessment.

**Table 5** Decision-making authorities

Decision-making authority	Relevant legislation
1. Minister for Transport	<i>Air Navigation Act 1937</i>

Figure 1 – Regional location





**Figure 2 – Development envelope encompassing the airport**

