

Decision Report

Application for Licence

Part V Division 3 of the Environmental Protection Act 1986

| Licence Number | L9429/2024/1 |
|------------------|--|
| Applicant ACN | George Weston Foods Limited 008 429 632 |
| File number | DWERDT966066 |
| Premises | George Weston Foods Feedmill 61 Armstrong Road HOPE VALLEY WA 6165 |
| | Legal description: Lot 1024 on Plan 4000629 as defined by the premises map in Schedule 1 |
| Date of report | 27/06/2024 |
| Decision | Licence granted |

Table of Contents

| 1. | Decision summary | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2. | Scop | e of assessment3 | | | | | | | |
| | 2.1 | Regulatory framework | | | | | | | |
| | 2.2 | Applic | ation summary and overview of premises | 3 | | | | | |
| | | 2.2.1 | Background | 3 | | | | | |
| | 2.3 | Opera | tional aspects | 3 | | | | | |
| | 2.4 | Applic | ant environmental studies | 4 | | | | | |
| | | 2.4.1 | Noise emissions | 4 | | | | | |
| | | 2.4.2 | Particulate matter (PM) emissions | 4 | | | | | |
| 3. | Risk a | assess | sment | 5 | | | | | |
| | 3.1 | Source | e-pathways and receptors | 5 | | | | | |
| | | 3.1.1 | Emissions and controls | 5 | | | | | |
| | | 3.1.2 | Receptors | 8 | | | | | |
| | 3.2 | Risk ra | atings | 9 | | | | | |
| 4. | Cons | ultatio | n | 12 | | | | | |
| 5. | Decis | ion | | 12 | | | | | |
| 6. | Conc | lusion | | 12 | | | | | |
| Refe | erence | s | | 12 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Table | e 1: Pro | posed | applicant controls | 5 | | | | | |
| Table | e 2: Ser | nsitive h | numan and environmental receptors and distance from prescribed act | ivity.8 | | | | | |
| Table cons | e 3: Ris truction | k asses , comm | ssment of potential emissions and discharges from the Premises durin | וg 10 | | | | | |
| Table | e 4: Cor | nsultatio | on | 12 | | | | | |

1. Decision summary

This decision report documents the assessment of potential risks to the environment and public health from emissions and discharges during the operation of the premises. As a result of this assessment, licence L9429/2024/1 has been granted.

2. Scope of assessment

2.1 Regulatory framework

In completing the assessment documented in this decision report, the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (the department; DWER) has considered and given due regard to its regulatory framework and relevant policy documents which are available at https://dwer.wa.gov.au/regulatory-documents.

2.2 Application summary and overview of premises

On 25 January 2024, George Weston Foods Limited (the applicant) submitted an application for a licence to the department under section 57 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act).

The application is to operate an animal feed mill constructed under works approval W6466/2020/1.

The premises relates to the category 23: animal feed manufacturing and has an assessed production capacity of up to 655,200 tonnes per annual period of animal feed produced. The operations, infrastructure and equipment relating to the premises category and any associated activities which the department has considered in line with *Guideline: Risk Assessments* (DWER 2020).

2.2.1 Background

The premises was issued with a works approval W6466/2020/1 on 17 March 2021 which expired on 16 March 2024 with the premises being able to operate until the licence is given as per condition 5 (b) of the works approval.

Time-limited operations under W6466/2020/1 commenced on 14 August 2023 with a time limited compliance report submitted on 28 February 2024. After a request for further information was sent by the department on 14 February 2024, the applicant submitted Environmental Compliance Reports on 28 February 2024, and it was determined by the delegated officer that there was sufficient information provided to determine compliance with works approval W6466/2020/1.

The premises has received three complaints from two separate complainants has been submitted to the department while the premises has been operating under a works approval. These complaints were related to excessive dust and odour emissions. One complaint occurred during construction with the other two occurring while the feedmill was operating under time limited operations.

2.3 Operational aspects

The feed mill is proposed to have a maximum production capacity of 655,200 tonnes per annum (tpa).

The proposed feed mill will accept raw materials in the form of grains, meals, oils and food additives to produce animal feed in the form of pellets. The process is primarily physical and includes grinding, mixing, liquid addition, heating, pressing and cooling. The facility is designed to operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

The production process involves the receipt of solid raw materials through an intake building with enclosed tunnels fitted with automated vehicle entry/exit doors. Liquid additives, such as tallow, are received by truck into dedicated storage tanks or vessels.

Solid raw materials are transferred via conveyors and batch mixed within vessels. Steam from a small gas-fired boiler is blended through each batch before the mix is fed through a pellet press. The pellets are then fed through a process to cool the product, remove fines and oversize particles, then mix through oils.

Pelletised feed is loaded onto trucks within the loadout building tunnels that are also fitted with automated vehicle doorways.

2.4 Applicant environmental studies

2.4.1 Noise emissions

The applicant undertook an assessment of potential noise impacts, including noise modelling, using computer modelling software SoundPlan. The premises is located within the Latitude 32 Industrial Park precinct of Hope Valley, therefore just outside of Area A and within Area B of the *Environmental Protection (Kwinana) (Atmospheric Wastes) Policy 1999* (Kwinana EPP). This means that specific noise regulations in the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997* (Noise Regulations) applicable to premises within Area A of the Kwinana EPP do not apply to the assessment of noise emissions from this premises. The nearest noise sensitive receivers are a dwelling at least 1.8 km to the south of the feedmill, zoned as special use; residential dwellings approximately 2.6 km south, within the residential suburb of Medina; and a dwelling approximately 3 km to the northeast, slightly north of the Alcoa Kwinana Residue Storage Area. Existing industry is located adjacent to the west and north of the premises.

As the premises is within an industrial precinct, the delegated officer focused on predicted impacts at industrial receptors in proximity to the premises. The assigned level for industrial receivers is 65 db ($L_{A 10}$). The applicant's noise modelling showed that all the noise monitoring points on the edge of the premises were under the assigned level for industrial receivers of 65 db ($L_{A 10}$). The highest level of noise ($L_{A 10}$) was recorded onsite within one metre of the louvres being 75 db ($L_{A 10}$). There were additional spikes recorded outside of the limits which were likely caused by fire trucks passing through from the nearby fire station.

Subject to the risk assessment outcomes, the delegated officer is of the view that considering the low level of noise generated from the premises that no additional monitoring conditions need to be added.

2.4.2 Particulate matter (PM) emissions

The applicant undertook an assessment of air emissions from the from the three cyclone stacks at the premises. The test parameters included total particulate matter, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and oxygen. Two rounds of testing were completed with one in November 2023 and second in January 2024.

The nearest sensitive receivers are a dwelling at least 1.8 km to the south of the feedmill, zoned as special use; residential dwellings approximately 2.6 km south, within the residential suburb of Medina; and a dwelling approximately 3 km to the northeast, slightly north of the Alcoa Kwinana Residue Storage Area. The Perth Motorplex is also located 1.2 km to the south.

The monitoring of particulate matter was compared to the limits set under the works approval W6466/2020/1 and found that both rounds of emission detections were compliant with the limits set by the works approval. The monitoring didn't sample any dust emissions from the outtake and intake tunnels which was noted as being an additional source of dust emissions in the works approval.

Subject to the risk assessment outcomes, the delegated officer is of the view that due to the low level of dust generated from the premises that no additional monitoring conditions need to be added.

3. Risk assessment

The department assesses the risks of emissions from prescribed premises and identifies the potential source, pathway and impact to receptors in accordance with the *Guideline: Risk Assessments* (DWER 2020).

To establish a risk event there must be an emission, a receptor which may be exposed to that emission through an identified actual or likely pathway, and a potential adverse effect to the receptor from exposure to that emission.

3.1 Source-pathways and receptors

3.1.1 Emissions and controls

The key emissions and associated actual or likely pathway during premises operation which have been considered in this decision report are detailed in Table 1 below. Table 1 also details the control measures the applicant has proposed to assist in controlling these emissions, where necessary.

| Emission | Sources | Potential pathways | Proposed controls | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Operation | Operation | | | | | | | |
| Fugitive dust and fugitive | Acceptance of raw | Air /windborne | Solid raw materials unloaded within dedicated building with intake tunnels. | | | | | |
| odour | materials | pathway | Tunnels are enclosed with fast-action vehicle doorways with manual override. | | | | | |
| | | | Dust extraction system within tunnels inclusive supervisory control and data acquisition (SCAI alarm system to alert instances of failure or malfunction of the extraction system. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

 Table 1: Proposed applicant controls

1

| | | | 5 |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | | Dust extraction system within tunnels inclusive of a supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) alarm system to alert instances of failure or malfunction of the extraction system. |
| | | | Applicant has option to divert trucks to an alternative tunnel if extraction system inoperable. |
| | Movement of grains and meal through conveyors | | Conveyor system with dust extraction system that operates when the conveyor starts. Note that applicant has not specified the extent to which conveyors are closed. |
| | | | Includes alarm systems for extraction system failure or malfunctions. |
| | Micro and macro | | Enclosed process batch vessels with vacuum system for transfer of ingredients to storage bins. |
| | addition | | Dust extraction system that operates automatically when the vacuum delivery system starts. |
| | | | Includes an alarm system for extraction system failure or malfunction. |
| | Mixing (spraying oil | - | Enclosed batch style mixer fed from enclosed tanks to the mixer via hard piping. |
| | on the grain). Pellet coating | | Enclosed batch style pellet coaters fed from enclosed tanks to the mixer via hard piping. |
| | lines | | Leak in pipework detected by low flow alarm on |

| Emission | Sources | Potential pathways | Proposed controls | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | the flow meter if the delivery pumps are running. Alarms are visible to the operator via a SCADA system. Visual inspection for leaks | |
| | Loadout of final pelletised | | Product (pellet) loading within dedicated enclosed tunnels with fast-action vehicle doorways with manual override. | |
| | product | | Dust extraction system with SCADA alarm system in the event of failure or malfunction. | |
| | | | Applicant can divert trucks to another tunnel if required. | |
| | | | Soft loading spouts extend into the trucks to minimise fall height minimising damage to pellets, and minimizing fugitive dust generation. Alarm system to alert instances of failure or malfunction of the loading spouts. | |
| | | | Truck drivers use a control panel to load trucks and visually monitor the filling. Truck drivers notify the operators if the loading spouts are not operating correctly. | |
| Noise | Vehicle movements onsite. | Air / windborne pathway | Truck movements will be limited whilst on site through appropriate traffic control measures. Approximate speed limit of 20 km/hr. | |
| | Operation of fixed plant | | Activities within enclosed buildings. | |
| | within the feed mill and associated boilers. | | Note that Applicant provided minimal detail on acoustical control measures. | |
| | Operation of conveyors, conveyor drives and extraction fans. | | | |
| Wastewater | Blow down water from the boiler | Direct discharge to land and soil, infiltration to groundwater. | Disposed of to the sewer under a trade waste permit; or, if it does not meet sewer requirements, will be disposed of offsite as trade waste. | |
| Point source particulate matter | Post pelleting cooling, fine grain | Air / windborne pathway | Dust filter extraction systems for intake and outloading tunnels, fine grain cleaning, conveyors and micro/macro ingredients area. | |
| | cleaning, intake and product outloading tunnels, | | Post pelleting cooling exhaust directed via cyclones for particulate treatment with three cyclone cooler stacks 34.5m from ground level (6.5 m above roofline). | |

| Emission | Sources | Potential pathways | Proposed controls |
|--|---|--|---|
| | conveyors and micro/macros ingredients area | | SCADA alarm system for cyclone failure. Pressure sensors indicate product blocking ductwork. Applicant can inspect and clean ductwork; and/or use alternate pelleting lines until ductwork is cleaned. |
| Point source odour | | | Key odour source associated with post pelleting cooling process will discharge via stacks 6.5 m above the roofline (34.5 m from ground level) for improved dispersion. Stack exit temperature from cyclone cooling stacks will be approximately 50°C. |
| Failure of containment of liquids (including oils and food additives) | Receival, transfer and storage of liquids | Direct discharge to land. Spills and/or leaks potentially contaminatin g stormwater. | Truck driver will confirm connections are secure prior to starting pumps when delivering liquids. Dry running sensor will confirm delivery truck is empty and stops the pump. Truck delivery area is bunded such that spills can be cleaned up and disposed of. High-high level indicator in each tank cuts off pump to prevent overfilling. Tanks are located within a bunded area. Truck driver has visual indication of overflow pipe if high-high sensor malfunctions. |
| Wastewater contaminated with hydrocarbons | Wastewater from the truck rinse system for trucks entering the loadout tunnel. | Direct discharge to land. Infiltration to groundwater. | Truck rinse facility will be a closed loop system to minimise water use, i.e. recycling the wastewater. Truck rinse has a perimeter kerb to prevent wastewater leaving the rinse facility, and prevent clean stormwater entering the facility. 1.5 m side screens to prevent overspray. Any wastewater produced from the truck rinse facility will be disposed of offsite. Sediment trap will be checked regularly, with sediment removed and disposed of at an appropriate facility as required. Oil water separator will be used to remove free floating hydrocarbons from the wastewater in the sediment basin. Any petroleum hydrocarbons recovered by the oil water separator will be collected and stored in weatherproof containers for disposal at a licensed waste facility. Spill kits will be kept at the truck rinse facility. If the spill kits are used, they will be disposed of at a licensed waste facility. |
| Raw materials, hydrocarbons, liquids (oils and food | General spills and leaks | Direct discharge to land. Spills and/or | All stormwater generated from impervious surfaces on the premises will be retained and infiltrate to groundwater. Depth to groundwater is approximately 17 m. |

| Emission | Sources | Potential pathways | Proposed controls |
|--|---------|--|---|
| additives) or final product potentially contaminating stormwater | | leaks of raw materials or products, potentially contaminatin g stormwater. | The base and side slopes of the basins and swales will be planted to promote nutrient uptake. Processing / transfer of materials within enclosed or covered buildings. |

3.1.2 Receptors

In accordance with the *Guideline: Risk Assessment* (DWER 2020), the Delegated Officer has excluded the applicant's employees, visitors, and contractors from its assessment. Protection of these parties often involves different exposure risks and prevention strategies, and is provided for under other state legislation.

Table 2 below provides a summary of potential human and environmental receptors that may be impacted as a result of activities upon or emission and discharges from the prescribed premises *(Guideline: Environmental Siting* (DWER 2020)).

| Human receptors | Distance from premises boundary | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Industrial premises | Located adjacent to the north and west. Site is located within the Latitude 32 Industrial Area. | | |
| Perth Motorplex | 1.2 km south | | |
| Nearest residential dwellings (zoned urban) | Dwellings (zoned urban) approximately 2.6 km south within the residential suburb of Medina | | |
| Dwelling | At least 1.8 km S (zoned public purposes – special uses) | | |
| Dwelling | Approximately 3 km NE (zoned rural) | | |
| Environmental receptors | Distance from premises boundary | | |
| Geomorphic wetland | Long Swamp (conservation sumpland) located approximately 430 m NE. Hendy Road Swamps (resource enhancement and multiple use wetland) located approximately 300 m and 430 ESE. Conway Road Swamp (resource enhancement wetland) located approximately 610 m SW. | | |
| Groundwater | Within the Cockburn Groundwater Area, proclaimed under the <i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914.</i> Groundwater is more than 17 m below ground level (bgl). Salinity in the superficial aquifer in the Cockburn groundwater area ranges from less than 130 mg/L TDS to over 12,000 mg/L but is typically less than 1,000 mg/L. | | |
| Environmental Protection (Kwinana) (Atmospheric Wastes) Policy 1999 (EPP)The premises is located within the EPP, Area B and the Enviro Protection (Kwinana) (Atmospheric Wastes) Regulations 1992 are a to the operations of the premises with regards to total suspended part The ambient air quality standard and limit for TSP within Area B are s and 260 µg/m³ respectively across a 24 hour averaging period. | | | |

Table 2: Sensitive human and environmental receptors and distance from prescribed activity

3.2 Risk ratings

Risk ratings have been assessed in accordance with the *Guideline: Risk Assessments* (DWER 2020) for each identified emission source and considers potential source-pathway and receptor linkages as identified in Section 3.1. Where linkages are in-complete they have not been considered further in the risk assessment.

Where the applicant has proposed mitigation measures/controls (as detailed in Section 3.1), these have been considered when determining the final risk rating. Where the delegated officer considers the applicant's proposed controls to be critical to maintaining an acceptable level of risk, these will be incorporated into the licence as regulatory controls.

Additional regulatory controls may be imposed where the applicant's controls are not deemed sufficient. Where this is the case the need for additional controls will be documented and justified in Table 3.

Licence L9249/2024/1 that accompanies this decision report authorises emissions associated with the operation of the premises i.e. animal feed manufacturing.

The conditions in the issued licence, as outlined in Table 3 have been determined in accordance with *Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions* (DER 2015).

Table 3: Risk assessment of potential emissions and discharges from the premises during operation

| Risk Event | | | | Risk rating ¹ | Reasoning and justification for additional regulatory controls | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Source/Activities | Potential emission | Potential receptors, pathways, and impact | Applicant controls | C = consequence L = likelihood | | Regulatory controls (refer to conditions of the granted instrument) | |
| Operation | | | | | | | |
| Ingredient intake, handling, storage and transfer | Fugitive dust – receipt, handling and storage of solid materials | Air/windborne pathway causing impacts to health and amenity.Ref Tab with sec 3.1.Adjacent industrial premises. Perth Motorplex 1.2 km S. Nearest urban residentialSec 3.1. | Air/windborne pathway causing impacts to health and amenity.Refer to Table 1 within section 3.1.1.Adjacent industrial premises. Perth Motorplex 1.2 km S. Nearest urban residential3.1.1. | Refer to Table 1 within section 3.1.1. | C = Minor: low level impact to amenity at a local scale. L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most circumstances. Medium Risk | The delegated officer determined that the applicant's proposed controls were generally reasonable and appropriate. For air emissions the application demonstrated compliance with the design criteria of 50 mg/m ³ which was applied to the premises. Fugitive dust is expected to be minimal if solid raw materials are only stored or stockpiled within dedicated bins, silos, hoppers or otherwise within enclosed buildings. Furthermore, if any spilt or accumulated solid materials outside of buildings is removed from ground level surfaces daily. | Condition 1 – infrastructure and equipment operation requirements Conditions 2 and 3 – fugitive dust conditions |
| | Odour | | | C = Slight: minimal impacts to amenity at a local scale L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most circumstances Low Risk | The applicant provided no updated odour emissions monitoring or modelling as this was not required under the works approval. The delegate officer has determined that the reporting and recording requirements for complaints as sufficient controls. | Condition 1 – infrastructure and equipment operation requirements | |
| | Noise | | | C = Minor, specific consequence criteria are likely to be met. L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most circumstances Medium Risk | Refer to discussion of the applicant's noise assessment in section 2.4.1. The applicant's noise monitoring indicates compliance with assigned levels for industrial receptors. Taking this into account, the delegated officer has not imposed any further conditions to noise emissions. | N/A | |
| | Liquid additive loss of containment, spill and overflow | Localised contamination of soil with liquids. Potentially contaminated stormwater runoff or infiltration to groundwater. | Refer to Table 1 within section Error! Reference source not found. | C = Minor: low level onsite impacts L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most circumstances Medium Risk | The applicant outlined reasonable controls for the prevention of overflows. Secondary containment of liquid additive storage tanks or vessels is the primary control against spills and loss of containment from tanks or vessels and truck transfer. Detail on proposed secondary containment design specifications in the application was limited therefore the delegated officer has specified a minimum level of containment that is considered appropriate to manage the risk. | Condition 1 – infrastructure and equipment operation requirements | |
| | Contaminated stormwater discharge through contact with spilt solid materials | Localised contamination of soil and/or groundwater with sediments and/or nutrients. | Refer to Table 1 within section 3.1.1. | C = Minor, specific consequence criteria are likely to be met. L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most circumstances Medium Risk | Noting that materials receipt, storage, handling, and product loading occurs within buildings, the delegated officer does not expect impacts to occur. The most likely cause of contaminated stormwater is through contact with stored or spilt ingredients or product in open areas exposed to rainfall. The delegated officer has therefore included conditions relating to the storage of materials and cleanup up of any spilt materials. | Conditions 2, 3 and 4 – fugitive dust and stormwater conditions | |
| Feed processing and manufacture | Point source emissions to air – particulate matter from cooler stacks | Air/windborne pathway causing impacts to health and amenity. Adjacent industrial premises. Perth Motorplex 1.2 km S. | Refer to Table 1 within section 3.1.1. | C = Minor: low level impact to amenity at local scale. L = Possible: could occur at some time. Medium Risk | Refer to discussion of the applicant's air dispersion modelling in section 2.4.2. The delegated officer determined that the applicant's proposed controls were generally reasonable and appropriate. For air emissions the application demonstrated compliance with the design criteria of 50 mg/m ³ which was applied to the premises The delegated officer has determined that ongoing requirements for at bi-annual stack sampling of the cooling stacks. | Condition 1 – infrastructure and equipment operation requirements Conditions 5, 6 and 7 – point source emissions to air requirements | |
| | Odour (including point source from cooler stacks) | premises 2.6 km S. | | C = Minor: low level impact to amenity at a local scale. L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most circumstances. Medium Risk | The applicant provided no updated odour emissions monitoring or modelling as this was not required under the works approval. The delegate officer has determined that the reporting and recording requirements for complaints as sufficient controls. | Condition 1 – infrastructure and equipment operation requirements Condition 8 – Reporting and recording requirements for complaints | |
| | Fugitive dust | | | C = Minor: low level impact to amenity at a local scale. L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most circumstances. Medium Risk | The delegated officer determined that the applicant's proposed controls were generally reasonable and appropriate. For air emissions the application demonstrated compliance with the design criteria of 50 mg/m ³ which was applied to the premises. Fugitive dust is expected to be minimal if solid raw materials are only stored or stockpiled within dedicated bins, silos, hoppers or otherwise within enclosed buildings. Furthermore, if any spilt or accumulated solid materials outside of buildings is removed from ground level surfaces daily. | Condition 1 – infrastructure and equipment operation requirements Conditions 2 and 3 – fugitive dust and stormwater conditions | |
| | Noise | | | C = Minor: low level impacts to amenity at a local scale L = Possible: could occur at some time Medium Risk | Refer to discussion of the applicant's noise assessment in section 2.4.1. The applicant's noise monitoring indicates compliance with assigned levels for industrial receptors. Taking this into account, the delegated officer has not imposed any further conditions to noise emissions. | N/A | |
| | Discharge of stormwater contaminated through contact with spilt or trafficked material | Localised contamination of soil and/or groundwater with sediment and nutrient. | Refer to Table 1 within section 3.1.1. | C = Minor, specific consequence criteria are likely to be met. L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most circumstances Medium Risk | Noting that materials receipt, storage, handling, and product loading occurs within buildings, the delegated officer does not expect impacts to occur. This most likely cause of contaminated stormwater is through contact with stored or spilt materials in open areas exposed to rainfall. The delegated officer has therefore included conditions relating to the storage of materials and cleanup up of spilt materials. | Conditions 2, 3 and 4 – fugitive dust and stormwater conditions | |
| Product storage and handling | Fugitive dust | Air/windborne pathway causing impacts to health and amenity. | Refer to Table 1 within | C = Minor: low level impact to amenity at a local scale. L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most | The delegated officer determined that the applicant's proposed controls were generally reasonable and appropriate. For air emissions the application demonstrated compliance with the design criteria of 50 mg/m ³ which was applied to the premises. | Condition 1 – infrastructure and equipment operation requirements Conditions 2 and 3 – fugitive dust and | |

| Dick Event | | | | Pick roting ¹ | Beaconing and justification for additional regulatory controls | |
|----------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Source/Activities | Potential emission | Potential receptors, pathways, and impact | Applicant controls | C = consequence L = likelihood | | Regulatory controls (refer to conditions of the granted instrument) |
| | | Adjacent industrial premises. se Perth Motorplex 1.2 km S. 3.4 Nearest urban residential premises 2.6 km S 3.4 | section 3.1.1. | circumstances. Medium Risk | Fugitive dust is expected to be minimal if solid raw materials are only stored or stockpiled within dedicated bins, silos, hoppers or otherwise within enclosed buildings. Furthermore, if any spilt or accumulated solid materials outside of buildings is removed from ground level surfaces daily. | stormwater conditions |
| | Noise | | C = Minor: low level impacts to at a local scale L = Possible: could occur at so Medium Risk | C = Minor: low level impacts to amenity at a local scale L = Possible: could occur at some time Medium Risk | Refer to discussion of the applicant's noise assessment in section 2.4.1. The applicant's noise monitoring indicates compliance with assigned levels for industrial receptors. Taking this into account, the delegated officer has not imposed any further conditions to noise emissions. | N/A |
| | Odour | C = Slight: minimal impacts to amenity local scale L = Unlikely: probably not occur in mos circumstances Low Risk | The applicant provided no updated odour emissions monitoring or modelling as this was not required under the works approval. The delegate officer has determined that the reporting and recording requirements for complaints as sufficient controls. | Condition 1 – infrastructure and equipment operation requirements | | |
| | Discharge of stormwater contaminated through contact with spilt or trafficked material | Localised contamination of soil and/or groundwater with sediment and nutrient. | Refer to Table 1 within section 3.1.1. | C = Minor: low level on-site impacts, minimal off-site impacts at a local scale. L = Unlikely: probably not occur in most circumstances. Medium Risk | Noting that materials receipt, storage, handling and product loading occurs within buildings, the delegated officer does not expect impacts to occur. The most likely cause of contaminated stormwater is through contact with stored or spilt materials in open areas exposed to rainfall. The Delegated Officer has therefore included conditions relating to the storage of materials and cleanup up of spilt materials. | Conditions 2, 3 and 4 – fugitive dust and stormwater conditions |
| Truck rinse facility | Wastewater contaminated with hydrocarbons and sediments. | Overland runoff and/or contamination of soil with hydrocarbons and sediments. | Refer to Table 1 within section 3.1.1. | C = Minor: low level on-site impacts L = Possible: could occur at some time. Medium Risk | The delegated officer determined that the applicant proposed controls were reasonable and will condition these in the licence. | Condition 1 – infrastructure and equipment operation requirements |

Note 1: Consequence ratings, likelihood ratings and risk descriptions are detailed in the Guideline: Risk Assessments (DWER 2020).

Note 2: Proposed applicant controls are depicted by standard text. Bold and underline text depicts additional regulatory controls imposed by department.

4. Consultation

Table 4 provides a summary of the consultation undertaken by the department.

Table 4: Consultation

| Consultation method | Comments received | Department response |
|--|---|---------------------|
| Application advertised on the department's website on 20 March 2024 | None received. | N/A |
| Local Government Authority advised of application on 20 March 2024 | | |
| Tadano Oceania advised of application on 20 March 2024 | | |
| Applicant was provided with draft documents on 25/06/2024 | The applicant requested minor administrative corrections. | Changes were made |

5. Decision

The delegated officer has determined to grant a licence to operate an animal feed mill. The decision takes into account the construction of the feed mill under works approval W6466/2020/1, the distance to receptors, proposed applicants operational controls (as detailed in Table 3) being generally appropriate and commensurate with the risk assessment outcomes to maintain an acceptable level of risk to the environment, public health and amenity to receptors during operations.

6. Conclusion

Based on the assessment in this decision report, the delegated officer has determined that a licence will be granted, subject to conditions commensurate with the determined controls and necessary for administration and reporting requirements.

References

- 1. Department of Environment Regulation (DER) 2015, *Guidance Statement: Setting Conditions*, Perth, Western Australia.
- 2. Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) 2020, *Guideline: Environmental Siting*, Perth, Western Australia.
- 3. DWER 2020, Guideline: Risk Assessments, Perth, Western Australia.
- 4. DWER 2021, Works Approval W6466/2020/1 Decision Report, Perth, Western Australia.
- 5. DWER 2021, Works Approval W6466/2020/1, Perth, Western Australia.
- 6. George Weston Foods Limited 2024, Application form, Perth, Western Australia.
- 7. RPS 2024, Time Limited Operations Compliance Report, Perth, Western Australia.