

For your records but not for publication:



Submission re Kamay Ferry Wharves – SSI-10049

Dear Director,

I am a resident of Maroubra and enjoy cycling to La Perouse for exercise and to enjoy the open expanse and beauty of the surrounding area. But it is not my personal loss, arising from your project, that motivates me to write to you.

Having read the EIS on the impact of this project, I find your conclusion that the environmental and heritage damage will be minimal, somewhat Orwellian. Moreover, your EIS does not take into account the impact of climate change moving forward. And neither do the mitigating measures that you propose.

Indeed, you are proposing – with clear sighted understanding – to damage the terrestrial and marine environment and the heritage of the area, knowing that you there are no solutions, just inadequate mitigating measures.

I object for the reasons made abundantly clear in the EIS. These are:

1. The “unavoidable” destruction of indigenous archaeological sites and heritage for which there is no solution other than attempted mitigation.
2. Destruction of non-indigenous heritage and history which again, cannot be avoided and only ameliorated.
3. Underwater heritage will be damaged by the construction process. Again, this can’t be avoided and can only be ameliorated.
4. Marine biodiversity will be unavoidably destroyed with only ameliorating measures available. Also the noise from the construction will affect marine life and will have “unknown” effects on archaeological heritage both underwater and on land.
5. Terrestrial biodiversity will be permanently destroyed with no ameliorating project available.

6. Traffic and transport congestion will be permanently exacerbated with no possibilities for ameliorating the problem.

I also object because it is a monumental waste of taxpayer money.

The feasibility study by NSW Transport and mega consultancy, ARUP, states clearly that government financial assistance will be required to facilitate the establishment of a ferry service between La Perouse and Kurnell, of which the capital cost alone is estimated at \$17m. In addition, there is also the cost of establishing related infrastructure eg. ticketing booths, toilet amenities and waiting areas for passengers, which have not been quantified. On top of this is the cost of unquantified subsidies to the operator of the service, paid for by the taxpayer.

And yet, the feasibility study makes clear that any business operating this service will be confronted with frequent operational interruptions borne of rough waters and unpredictable swell.

Moreover, any business attempting to operate in this environment will encounter growing unpredictability as we move deeper into climate change. Yet the feasibility study is silent on this matter.

The feasibility study also anticipates that large tourism operators like Bass and Flinders Cruises and Captain Cook Cruises will set up in Botany Bay. Yet the study ignores the impact of the increased road and traffic congestion on the local residents.

As a publicly funded leader in our state bureaucracy you are obligated to fulfill the requirements of the National Parks and Wildlife Act which stipulates that your agency is obliged to conserve the natural environment and cultural heritage. Everything in your proposal runs counter to this legal obligation.

Furthermore, you are asking taxpayers to subsidise commercial operations in public spaces with very little economic benefit to the wider community and at a great cost to a massively depleted environment.

I wonder, when will you and your agency start taking seriously the impact of climate change and the pressing need to conserve what remains of our increasingly distressed

environments? The cost of this project ought to be directed to building a more resilient environment so that our children have some chance of surviving the future.

Sincerely,

██████████