

Appendix H

SYDNEY SUPERYACHT MARINA - SUMMARY OF RESPONSE TO AUTHORITIES' SUBMISSIONS

Issues Raised	Response
NSW Maritime	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally supportive. Will lift the marina services to the level comparable to interstate and overseas 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For commercial viability it will need, food, retail and licensed facilities which complement marina uses and provide a vibrant destination 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic circulation should be consistent with Figure 2 on page 33 of the EA to reduce queuing impacts awaiting the car park 	Not done. Amended circulation plan in Appendix A, approved by NSW Maritime
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loading and unloading of vehicles other than fuel tankers and delivery to berthed vessels to be at the rear of buildings 	Agreed 2.2.5, 2.4.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Out of hours deliveries on the foreshore should be limited to reduce acoustic impacts and have an operational management plan 	Agreed 2.2.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the maximum size of the pennant crane to 5.1m from existing ground level with maximum hoisting capacity of 5000 kg (or condition it) 	Agreed 2.5.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise limits and recommendations in the noise impact study in the EA will be adequate to address noise concerns 	2.2.1
City of Sydney	
<i>Planning processes for Bays Precinct</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development consents already issued and this application will likely render the new planning framework of the precinct superfluous 	2.6.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledges that the existing master plan framework is obsolete 	2.6.1
<i>Foreshore access</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricted access for customs or where boats are craned across a public way should be the only restrictions and for the shortest time possible 	Agreed 2.5.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals limiting public access to the foreshore (other than for public safety and security such as asset value) should be strongly resisted and consent refused for that part 	Agreed 2.5.1
<i>Ancillary uses</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses other than those proposed in the eastern building which may be ancillary could become dominant uses over time with environmental effects not canvassed in the proposal 	Noted. 2.1.1 specifies %s of area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only consent for uses directly related to the marina should be granted. Other uses such as cafes/ restaurants taverns etc should not be approved with this application but be subject to future separate applications 	Not agreed. The uses are either marine (including the yacht club, or are ancillary. 2.1.2
<i>Car Parking and Traffic</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incremental development in the area will have adverse impacts on congestion and the proposal should be considered with the cumulative effects of developments in the locale 	Not agreed 2.4.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendment of flows from MWT report 	2.4.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The traffic report does not consider service vehicles and restricting deliveries 	2.4.3

Issues Raised	Response
to outside peak hours	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the level of cycle parking and end of trip facilities under the NSW Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling 	2.4.8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a green travel plan for staff and users 	2.4.9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visitor parking being used by small service vehicles may force visitors to use on-street parking 	2.4.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design should cater for future pedestrian and cycle routes into, through and around the site, particularly the boardwalk corridor 	2.5.2
Leichhardt Municipal Council	
<i>Strategic Issues</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council does not concur with the objectives and detail of the Master Plan, hence compliance does not ensure quality design outcomes 	Noted 2.6.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new development should be approved until a new Bays Precinct Masterplan is completed 	2.6.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment lands under the Strategy should not negatively impact on surrounding commercial centres and the proposal may do so. The site lacks physical and perceptual linkages 	2.6.3, 2.6.4
<i>Transport and Traffic</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis should include event mode of the passenger terminal 	2.4.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely minimal mode share for public transport due to site characteristics, hours and transport availability 	2.4.7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The flexible floorplan enabling a function venue with large space has not been considered in the assessment re traffic 	2.4.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No consideration of redevelopment of Harold Park Paceway or event mode of passenger terminal 	2.4.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to include a network wide, micro-simulation including Cruise passenger terminal, Harold Park Paceway, Balmain Leagues Club redevelopment, including event mode 	2.4.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A taxi demand study is required to provide sufficient facilities 	2.4.7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need design contingencies if the car park creepers don't grow – visual impact 	2.7.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need a continuously accessible foreshore access. Consider other ways to protect assets rather than blocking foreshore access 	2.5.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent car parks on waters edge should be replaced with temporary bays 	2.4.4
<i>Urban Design</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent with DCP because of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flat roof not hipped or gabled Landscape character 7 	2.7.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Architectural treatment does not reflect fine grained character of waterside buildings in the area 	2.7.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not reflect the heritage built form of Balmain Snails Bay and Mort Bay 	2.7.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not reflect a sense of place or make a positive contribution to this place in its current social context 	2.7.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No indication on how the lift shaft will make a positive contribution to the sense of place, its identity or architectural merit or integration with existing buildings 	2.7.4

Issues Raised	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian promenade has no vertical features or definition of space, no indication of how it will be used. Microclimate effects not translated into urban design and landscape elements 	2.7.3
<i>Social Impact and Community Implications</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A full scale social impact assessment is required 	2.8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment does not define locality 	2.8.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A management plan and security plan should be required for the cluster of licensed premises 	2.8.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be a negative impact on perceived visual amenity and pedestrian access to water views and water frontage 	2.5.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should enhance public domain with pedestrian thoroughfares 	2.5.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No demographic data of the locality to support the assertion that the social landscape will not be changed by the development 	2.8.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived change of character from working harbour to and entertainment and privileged leisure precinct 	2.1.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Install public art referencing working harbour origins 	2.7.3
<i>Contamination</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An audit by the EPA should be conducted 	2.11
<i>Noise implications</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why were noise receptors R5 and R7 not suitable? 	2.2.6 and appendix F & G
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background noise levels from 2003 may not be relevant. More recent background levels should be taken over a 7 day period 	2.2.1 and Appendix F
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clustering of licensed premises and noise levels arising from alcohol consumption on site 	2.2.7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise generated by services eg garbage collection should be included 	Included 2.2.6 and appendix G
<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of increased private recreational boats on the contaminated seabed of Rozelle Bay and on dragon boat racers, rowers and kayakers 	Not applicable 2.9
Verity Firth MP	
<i>Noise and hours of operation</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No amplified music at any time 	Not agreed 2.2.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strict limits are required on hours of operation and the type of noise permissible 	Agreed 2.2.1, 2.2.3
<i>Proposed mixed uses</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certain types of commercial activity would be welcome 	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lack of control over the amount of space for any one use. There is a concern the marine uses could give way to entertainment uses. Need to ensure a reasonable mix of uses 	2.1.1
<i>Traffic</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of traffic at the James Craig Road City West Link intersection especially considering the future dry boat storage and Cruise Passenger terminal 	2.4.1
<i>Consultation</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of consultation with Glebe community 	2.3.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rozelle Bay should be primarily a maritime precinct 	2.1.3

Issues Raised	Response
DECCW	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No environmental protection licence will be required 	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a co or tri-generation plant is constructed such a licence may be required under the POEO Act 	Noted
RTA	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RTA has no proposals to upgrade the intersection of The Crescent and James Craig Road and reference to that in the EA should be discounted 	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RTA has requested the developer of the Cruise Passenger Terminal to upgrade that intersection 	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be detrimental effects on local roads in conjunction with other developments in the area. A cumulative traffic assessment to the satisfaction of Council should be undertaken of all future developments 	2.4.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Off street parking and loading facilities should be provided to council's satisfaction 	Noted 2.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Layout of car parks should comply with AS 	2.4.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 car park lifts may not be able to cope with 90+ car parks. Additional information to Council is required 	2.4.6
Transport NSW	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 65 bicycle spaces 	Noted 2.4.8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look to Bays Precinct Stage 1 and demonstrate a minimal approach to car parking is adopted 	2.4.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More details on pedestrian and cyclist activity to and through the site and improved access to public transport and active transport options 	2.5.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is Railcorp 11 KV cable on the western side of the site. Must liaise with RailCorp 	2.10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following matters be in the statement of commitments or conditions of consent: 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A services search for rail services before issue of a construction certificate 	2.10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If mixed use is modified, prepare a revised traffic and transport analysis for any amended project application 	2.4.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work place travel plan and travel access guide be prepared for employees and visitors 	2.4.9
Sydney Water	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing water system has capacity. Must connect to the existing 250mm main on James Craig Road 	Noted 2.10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing wastewater system has capacity. Must connect to the available 225mm main 	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any trade waste water must be by an application to permit discharge of trade wastewater into the sewerage system 	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must consider any industrial wastewater reuse scheme operating 	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must apply for a s73 certificate and pay for any adjustments 	Noted

Appendix H

SYDNEY SUPERYACHT MARINA - SUMMARY OF RESPONSE TO GENERAL PUBLIC'S SUBMISSIONS

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
	In Support (S)		
S	1 J Markham Rozelle Bay P/L	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Specific uses unknown so impacts unknown Parking and traffic implications 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1 2.4
S	2 J Livermore NSW Superyacht Industry Assoc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance appeal within the industry Improve amenity and amount of money spent for community Contribute to redevelopment of Rozelle Bay precinct Contribute to job creation and investment in NSW 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To point 4 – 2.1.2
	Objection (O)		
O	1 Glebe Pt Residents Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contravenes Masterplan preferred uses with extent of entertainment food & retail outlets Insufficient consultation with the community Noise implications of outdoor bands and amplified music Business mix on site not specified Traffic congestion when combined with other proposed developments 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1, 2.1.2 2.3.1 2.2.2 2.1.1 2.4.1
O	2 P Christensen	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed uses out of character with area Noise from bands, amplified music and large numbers of people Cannot see 4 storey car park on plans – wants to retain ridge vista to Balmain Want more plantings and coverings for the car park 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.4 2.2 2.5.3 2.7.2
O	3 J Cashmore 501 Glebe Pt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noise from outdoor bands Insufficient consultation Should not be an entertainment precinct 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.2 2.3. 2.1.3
O	4 M Lawrence & F Fricke	<p>M Lawrence – Noise impacts assessment report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No adjustment for tonal, impulsive or intermittent noise characters Needs to include higher wind speed in the modelling Reflection off the water not included Nearest receptor used is at 250m not at 230m which is the nearest residence Previous noise complaints from Liquidity restaurant with one band indicating noise levels in report are underestimated 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.6 and Appendix F & G As above As above As above As above Not agreed 2.2.2 2.1.2 and Appendix F

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		6. Seeks prohibition of any outdoor amplified music F Fricke 7. 2003 background levels should be checked due to use of the area changing since that time 8. Source of industrial noises not stated 9. 2003 measurements not taken at Glebe Pt – the closest residences 10. The spectrum of sound used in the report is not stated 11. Report does not take into account temperature inversion or the shape of the buildings 12. Sydney City Council criterion should be applied 13. No amplified music should be allowed at any time unless the balconies are enclosed	8. 2.2.6 and Appendix F & G 9. As above 10. As above 11. As above 12. As above 13. Not agreed 2.2.2 and 2.7.1
O	5 Glebe Society	1. Not working harbour use but an entertainment centre 2. Lack of public consultation 3. Ill defined use of site & lack of compliance with Masterplan, SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 and the DCP 4. No amplified music outdoors 5. Noise from mix of lots of people and music 6. Over development. All marina uses could be in one building. Ambit claim for an entertainment centre 7. Traffic management of area including Harold Park 8. Public access to foreshore should coordinate with whole Bays precinct 9. No provisions to regenerate natural communities, insufficient controls on runoff and rubbish 10. Reduce number of balconies and enclose them 11. Set mix of uses under strict requirements 12. Suspend approval until further consultation undertaken 13. Appendix has compliance tables for abovementioned documents with numerous matters	1. 2.1.3 2. 2.3.1 3. 2.1.1, 2.1.2 4. 2.2.2 5. 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 6. 2.1.3 7. 2.4.1 8. 2.5.1, 2.5.2 9. 2.7.2, 2.6.2 Table 11 – will be subject to environmental legislation 10. Not agreed, 2.2.3 11. 2.1.1 12. 2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2 13. See compliance tables in EA and 2.1.2
O	6 Coalition of Glebe Groups	1. Noise complaints from Liquidity 2. Noise (from outdoor bands) 3. Entertainment centre with entertainment, function centre and liquor outlets not in the Master Plan 4. Insufficient consultation with Glebe residents 5. Additional traffic from this and other developments 6. Outside music ought not be allowed	1. Noted. 2.2.2, 2.3.2 2. 2.2.2 3. 2.1.1, 2.1.3 4. 2.3.1 5. 2.4.1 6. Not agreed 2.2.2 7. 2.2.1, 2.2.3

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		7. Restrictions on hours of use of balconies and decks 8. Consent conditions should prescribe the business mix	8. 2.1.1
S	7 Sydney Harbour Association	1. Vessels at the marina will be viewed from Anzac Bridge – design practicalities 2. Simpler fenestration 3. Impact of western summer sun	1. 2.7 2. 2.7.1 3. The west building has a blank wall to the west. The east building faces south and south west
O	8 S Heiland	1. No outdoor amplified music 2. No control on non-maritime uses. Should be a maritime precinct 3. Increase in traffic	1. Not agreed. 2.2.2 2. 2.1.1, 2.1.3 3. 2.4.1
O	9 R Di Brazza	1. Contravenes Master plan as restaurants, function centres and liquor outlets are not preferred uses 2. Proposed uses not being considered as part of the approval 3. Noise 4. Insufficient consultation 5. No amplified outdoor music 6. Complaints from Liquidity re noise 7. Will be an entertainment centre not allowed under the Master Plan 8. Traffic congestion combined with other proposed uses	1. 2.1.2, 2.1.1X 2. 2.1.1 3. 2.2 4. 2.3.1 5. Not agreed 2.2.2 6. Noted 7. 2.1.3 8. 2.4.1
O	10 R Zwi	1. Should be maritime use not entertainment use 2. Too close to residences for amplified music 3. Previous complaints from Liquidity 4. Directors of SSM have not taken into account the concerns of residents following the meeting including have not given assurances as to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o limit of hours of music o double glazed and sound proof facilities o restricted number of days and nights for amplified music o restrict number of weeks per year for amplified music 	1. 2.1.3 2. 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 3. Noted 4. 2.2 Appendix D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2.2.2 o 2.2.4 o 2.2.2 o 2.2.2
O	11 J & M Cashmore	1. noise from music. Have had to request workers on the boats to turn down their radios 2. music should be in an acoustically insulated building 3. Noise from people fuelled by alcohol	1. noted 2. 2.2.4 3. 2.2.7

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Scale bigger than required for the marina 5. Could become a noisy unattractive entertainment and mixed business precinct being the antithesis of the master plan, compromising amenity for residents 6. Insufficient community consultation 7. Agreements of SSM directors does not reflect views of those present at the meeting 8. Contravenes intent of Master plan by making it an entertainment precinct 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. 2.1.1 5. 2.1.3, 2.1.4 6. 2.3.1, 2.3.2 7. 2.3.1 8. 2.1.3
O	12 M King	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern about noise may force her to move as further noise would be unbearable 2. Supports development of the marina but not an entertainment venue 3. Don't allow any outdoor music 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 2. 2.1.3 3. Not agreed 2.2.2
O	13 L Taylor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise (previous problems with Liquidity) 2. Uses should be maritime not entertainment 3. Traffic when combined with other developments 4. No outdoor amplified bands 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2.2 2. 2.1.3 3. 2.4.1 4. Not agreed 2.2.2
O	14 P Candley & J Astey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise – no noise detector in the Pavilions (501 Glebe Pt Road) 2. Problems of noise from Liquidity previously 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.1, 2.2, Appendix E & F 2. Noted
S	15 Boating Industry NSW	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is the only specialised marina of its kind in NSW which need to be modernised to meet contemporary standards 2. Enhancement of public amenity in waterfront precinct with public access to foreshore and recreation activities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.5 2. 2.5, 2.7.3
O	16 C Mason	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of transparency and publicity re the consultation process 2. Noise – problems in the past from Liquidity 3. Should be a maritime not an entertainment precinct 4. Amplified outdoor music should not be allowed 5. Need conditions for appropriate business mix for a maritime precinct 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.3.1 2. Noted 2.2 3. 2.1.3 4. Not agreed 2.2.2 5. 2.1.1
O	17 R & H Hewitt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. View impacts of berthed boats 2. Water traffic issues not addressed 3. Safety hazards on the Bay 4. Increased noise levels above that from Liquidity and partying superyachts 5. Prohibit outdoor amplified music 6. All music and entertainment be located to face the north west or Anzac Bridge 7. No outdoor park and open space provision. 10% of the area should be for public recreation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.5.3, 2.9 2. 2.9 3. 2.9 4. 2.2.1, 2.2 5. Not agreed 2.2.2 6. 2.2.2 7. 2.1.5

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		for yachties, local residents and visitors 8. Establish a Residents Consultative Committee with funding from SSM	8. 2.3.2
O	18 E Hilliard	1. Inadequate consultation 2. Noise not measured at the Pavilions 3. Effect of wind on water not taken into consideration 4. Not outdoor bands or amplified music (problems from Liquidity) 5. No justification for a tavern or retail liquor outlet as there are already enough in Balmain/Rozelle 6. No justification for a convention and function space – use Darling Harbour with better transport facilities 7. Uses uncertain	1. 2.3.1 2. 2.2.1, Appendix E & F 3. 2.2.6 and Appendix G 4. Not agreed 2.2.2 5. Tavern removed, 2.1.1, 2.8 6. Function centre removed 2.1.1 7. 2.1.1
O	19 Owners SP 8155 7-23 Stewart St (R Wheeler)	1. No consultation 2. Noise travels over water – problems from Liquidity 3. Outdoor amplified music noise cannot be captured 4. Balcony doors should be closed when music plays indoors 5. Restrictions on use of decks and balconies in the evenings 6. Seeks restricted trading hours: 8.00am – 10pm Mon-Thurs 8.00am – 11pm Fri –Sat 8.00 am– 8pm Sun 7. The entertainment precinct makes the maritime precinct secondary	1. 2.3.1 2. 2.2.6 and Appendix G 3. 2.2.2 4. 2.2.4 5. 2.2.3, 2.2.4 6. Not agreed 2.2.3 7. 2.1.3
O	20 T Clarke	Re Jones Bay Wharf Marina Extension – Not applicable	
O	21 T Clarke	Re Jones Bay Wharf Marina Extension – Not applicable	
O	22 R Wheeler	1. The entertainment precinct makes the maritime precinct secondary 2. Insufficient community consultation 3. Evening noise from Liquidity has been horrendous 4. Don't want any outdoor music 5. No specified areas for types of business 6. Maritime business are not stated to be the majority with food and retail as ancillary 7. No objection to accommodation for crews	1. 2.1.3 2. 2.3.1 3. noted 4. not agreed 2.2.2 5. 2.1.1 6. 2.1.1 7. noted

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Traffic in conjunction with other developments in area 9. Contravenes Master Plan re maritime use is not the main use 10. No outdoor music, balconies should be enclosed or closed when music played 11. Operating hours should be 8-10pm Mon-Sat and 8am-8pm Sun 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8. 2.4.1 9. 2.1.2 10. 2.2.2, 2.2.4 11. Not agreed 2.2.3
O	23 J Maxwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise from amplified music 2. Outdoor amplified music should not be allowed at any time 3. Want conditions in consent for appropriate business mix recognising it as a maritime precinct 4. More consultation with the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.2 2. Not agreed 2.2.2 3. 2.1.1 4. 2.3.1, 2.3.2
O	24 S Allen & S Hilliard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consultation inadequate 2. Noise assessment deficient. Need reading at closest residence 3. Effect of wind on water not taken from Blackwattle Bay 4. No outdoor bands or amplified music should be allowed 5. No justification for a tavern or retail liquor outlet 6. No justification for a convention and function space 7. Proposed uses uncertain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.3.1 2. 2.2.6 and appendix G 3. 2.2.6 and appendix G 4. Not agreed 2.2.2 5. Tavern removed 2.1.1 6. Function centre removed 2.1.1 7. 2.1.1
O	25 J Sleeman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise assessment methodology flawed – should use the Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing noise criteria 2. A change is 3dBA is not insignificant and ought not justify changing criteria from background 5dBA to 8dBA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.6 and appendix G 2. 2.2.6 and appendix G
O	26 R Blay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potential loss of peace in Rozelle Bay from partying and overindulgence in alcohol 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2, 2.8
S	27 J Waters – JW Marine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promotes working harbour 2. Will enhance the area, create jobs and attract tourists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.2 2. 2.1.2
S	28 R Morris MD of Morris Global	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will improve marine industry in NSW as per Working Harbour Plan 2. Increase number of superyachts 3. Inject investment and business confidence in the superyacht sector 4. Create jobs and investment in NSW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.2 2. 2.1.2 3. 2.1.2 4. 2.1.2
O	29 S Kalfas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Liquidity noise was unacceptable 2. Development not in keeping with historical use of Rozelle Bay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. noted 2. 2.1.3, 2.1.4

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Development will alter the ambiance of the foreshore walk 4. Introduces mixed use into a residential area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. 2.5, 2.5.1, 2.5.3 4. 2.1.4
S	30 M Garrett - Sunseeker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helps with the severe shortage of marina berths and marine based shore facilities 2. Will entice superyacht owners to come by offering the infrastructure they require with impacts on business and employment in NSW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.2 2. 2.1.2
O	31 R Di Brazza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the proposed uses? 2. Insufficient community consultation 3. Noise and outdoor amplified music (complaints from Liquidity) 4. Uses not specified by it makes it an entertainment precinct not a maritime one 5. Traffic concerns at junction of Robert Road and James Craig Road with the Cruise Passenger Terminal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1 2. 2.3.1 3. 2.2 4. 2.1.1, 2.1.3 5. 2.4.1
O	32 R Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Squanders a foreshore location for commercial development 2. Non compliances with the master plan, including water front uses being subservient to commercial uses 3. Noise from balconies. No outdoor eating unless behind double glazed enclosed balconies 4. No live music should be permitted 5. Traffic from Cruise passenger terminal 6. Insufficient community consultation 7. Prospect of commercial uses making it an entertainment precinct not a marine one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1, 2.1.4 2. 2.1.2 3. 2.2.3, 2.2.4 4. not agreed 2.2.2 5. 2.4.1 6. 2.3.1 7. 2.1.3
O	33 M Lawrence & L Simpson-Booker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operational noise impacts 2. Deficient noise analysis in environmental assessment underestimate the effect of noise 3. No outdoor amplified music but if there is, restrict number, time and noise level 4. Balcony doors need to be able to be shut and balconies need to be fully enclosed 5. Need ongoing community consultation 6. Need noise monitoring after operating starts 7. Do not permit tavern 8. Uses should be refocused on maritime with eg a restaurant as a minor adjunct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.1 2. 2.2.6 and appendix G 3. 2.2.2 4. 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 5. 2.3.2 6. 2.2.4 7. Removed 2.1.1 8. 2.1.1
O	34 H Middleton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate consultation 2. traffic from passenger terminal and junction with Robert Road and James Craig Road 3. Noise from Liquidity means objections to other licensed facilities 4. The proposal will change the character of Rozelle Bay and remove the working harbour which is our heritage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.3.1 2. 2.4.1 3. 2.2 4. 2.1.3, 2.1.4 5. 2.1.3

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. It will become an entertainment precinct not a maritime one 6. Uncontrolled commercial development will lead to a loss of control over public infrastructure and community assets and amenities 7. Commercial development has windfall profits for developers and government 8. Preserve Rozelle Bay for passive water for community boating activities eg rowing and dragon boat racing 9. Remove superyacht marina and shift the dry boat storage to Glebe Island no 1 or 2, preserve charter vessels and fishing fleets in Blackwattle and Rozelle Bays and marine contracting and salvage businesses 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. 2.1.2 (table 4) 7. This is not relevant to assessment of this proposal 8. 2.9 9. 2.1.5
O	35 Anonymous	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise (problems with Liquidity) 2. Proposed uses establish an entertainment centre in a residential area 3. No outdoor music and restrictions on noise levels in sound insulated activity areas 4. Support maritime related activities in the maritime precinct 5. Should reflect the intention of the master plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2 2. 2.1.3, 2.1.4 3. 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 4. 2.1.1 5. 2.1.2
O	36 L Lynch & S Tiffin	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An ad hoc development. Should wait until there is a strategic plan for the whole bays area 2. Usurping of local government planning by Government 3. Noise from outdoor amplified music and entertainment 4. Uses should be defined before approval – they are open ended 5. Will transform the site into a commercial/entertainment precinct with little connection to maritime and foreshore 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.6.2 2. Beyond the scope of assessment of this proposal 3. 2.2.2 4. 2.1.1 5. 2.1.3
O	37 P Thomas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise - no outdoor entertainment. All noise contained within the buildings 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not agreed 2.2.2, 2.2.4
O	38 R & H Hewitt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moored boats will restrict views of the 3 bridges, be a safety hazard, overcrowd and be a safety hazard 2. Prohibit amplified outdoor music and have all music and entertainment face north west 3. Lack of inclusion of parks and public open space 10% of the area should be for yachties, residents and visitors for public recreation 4. Ongoing community consultation is required 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal makes no alteration to the approved mooring facilities 2.9 2. 2.2.2 3. 2.1.5 4. 2.3.2
O	39 E Diffey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise – problems from Liquidity and intoxicated persons 2. Maritime uses may be overwhelmed by entertainment and licensed venues 3. Control the number of restaurants/cafes and no taverns or function centres 4. Size will increase traffic 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.7 2. 2.1.3 3. 2.1.1 4. 2.4.1

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Not displayed in Glebe. Should have been a large public meeting 6. Want a quiet low key development with maritime affiliations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. 2.1.3 6. 2.1.1
O	40 K & T Morrison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The entertainment precinct is out of synch with the maritime industrial nature and working harbour expectation 2. Noise – problems with Liquidity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1 2. 2.2
O	41 R Zwi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Précis of her letter in submission 10 2. Should be for maritime not entertainment 3. Noise pollution from Liquidity 4. Proposal for 2 bands, 9 hours a day 7 days a week does not represent the sentiment of the community meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 2.1.3 3. noted 4. 2.2.2
O	42 S Zwi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should be for maritime not entertainment 2. Too close to residences for amplified music 3. Does not object to maritime uses, but the apparent primary use of entertainment 4. Noise pollution across the water (Liquidity) 5. Lack of undertakings from the developers re noise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.3 2. 2.2.2, 2.2.1 3. 2.1.3 4. 2.2.1 5. 2.2.1,
O	43 A Crouch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entertainment will be significant use 2. No outdoor amplified music at any time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1 2. 2.2.2
O	44 R Thew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise from Liquidity 2. Late community consultation 3. Contravenes intent of master plan for uses 4. Construction hours are too long – should be 7am-4pm Mon-Fri and 7am-1pm Saturday 5. No outdoor amplified music 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2.2 2. 2.1.3 3. 2.1.2 4. would be conditioned 5. Not agreed 2.2.2
O	45 R Dawson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was supposed to be temporary in 2000 2. Superyachts monopolizing the small bay is at odds with other uses of the bay 3. Superyachts should be moved to Birkenhead Point 4. Darling Harbour provides a place to eat and drink 5. Insufficient sustainability design features eg pollution and gas guzzling superyachts 6. We don't need a drinking spot to 2am 7. Noise from Liquidity and phone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted, however see 2.1.1 2. 2.9 3. 2.1.5 4. Noted 2.1.1 5. 2.6.2 Table 11 6. 2.2.3 7. 2.2.1
O	46 J Bowers & J Hutchison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise pollution from Liquidity affected quality of life 2. Lack of controls on use mean potential for maritime uses to be overshadowed by commercial and entertainment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. noted 2. 2.1.3 3. 2.4.1

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Traffic at Robert Road and James Craig Road junction 4. Want more comprehensive consultation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. 2.3.1, 2.3.2
O	47 L Bushell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate community consultation 2. Inappropriate uses for a working harbour location close to residences 3. Amplified music in outdoor pedestrian areas will disturb residents and cause traffic congestion 4. Noisy activities should be restricted to sound proofed buildings with no open balconies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.3.1 2. 2.1.3, 2.1.4 3. 2.2.1, 2.2.2 4. Not agreed, but subject to noise limits 2.2.1
O	48 R Hammett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise from Liquidity 2. Flaws in noise assessment (receivers used, apartments in the development) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. 2.2.6 and appendix G
O	49 N Balaam & M Manton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is for an entertainment centre not consistent with a working harbour 2. Noise with 2am closing time, the amphitheatre effect from the balconies 3. Problems from Liquidity 4. Outdoor music is unnecessary 5. Inadequate community consultation 6. Should be a 10pm closing for the tavern 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.3 2. 2.2.1, 2.2.3 3. noted 4. 2.2.2 5. 2.3.1 6. Tavern removed
O	50 K Jarry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise from Liquidity. Accepts noise from working harbour 2. Seeking to make it an entertainment/bar area 3. Support marine activities but this is not working harbour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. 2.1.3 3. 2.1.3
O	51 J Nguyen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise from Liquidity and outdoor amplified music 2. Maritime uses could become secondary to entertainment 3. Traffic at junction of Robert Road and James Craig Road 4. Minimal consultation 5. Should have no outdoor amplified music and condition an appropriate business mix recognising a maritime precinct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.2 2. 2.1.3 3. 2.4.1 4. 2.3.1 5. 2.1.1, 2.2.2
O	52 T Nguyen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise from Liquidity and outdoor amplified music 2. Maritime uses could become secondary to entertainment 3. Traffic at junction of Robert Road and James Craig Road 4. Minimal consultation 5. Should have no outdoor amplified music and condition an appropriate business mix recognising a maritime precinct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.2 2. 2.1.3 3. 2.4.1 4. 2.3.1 5. 2.1.1, 2.2.2
O	53 J Byrne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise from Liquidity 2. Initial consultation did not include others outside the Pavilions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. noted 2. 2.3.1

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		3. No outdoor live music should be permitted	3. Not agreed 2.2.2
O	54 J Wilson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community not consulted appropriately 2. Noise from bands 3. No clearly defined terms of reference for the multi use of the site 4. Difficulty controlling noise with multiple lessees 5. No live amplified music bands outside 6. Traffic congestion from the dry boat storage and cruise passenger terminal 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.3.1 2. 2.2.2 3. 2.1.1 4. 2.2.1 5. 2.2.2 6. 2.4.1
O	55 M Teh	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Little community consultation 2. Have had loud music from visiting vessels 3. There is potentially a 24/7 entertainment complex 4. Don't want amplified music from open balconies at 2am 5. Want the developers' undertakings to be honoured 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.3.1 2. Subject to conditions in marina DA 088-05-08 3. 2.1.3, 2.2.3 4. 2.2.3 5. These would be conditioned as amended in this PPR, 2.2
O	56 J Bryan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise – should be no amplified outdoor music 2. 24 hour operation is bad for health and well being of residents 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.2 2. 2.2.3
O	57 R & P Bruce	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Little community consultation 2. Have had loud music from visiting vessels 3. There is potentially a 24/7 entertainment complex 4. Don't want amplified music from open balconies at 2am 5. Want the developers' undertakings to be honoured 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.3.1 2. Subject to conditions in marina DA 088-05-08 3. 2.1.3, 2.2.3 4. 2.2.3 5. These would be conditioned as amended in this PPR, 2.2
O	58 M Burgess	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise assessment discussion about 3dBA being insignificant 2. No measurements at location R5 3. No constraints on monitoring and controlling noise 4. Change of purpose for the precinct to entertainment facilities 5. 2am closing for a tavern is too late 6. Current problems include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Leaving floodlights on b. Superyachts booming music at night while partying c. Power saws and equipment operating at the marina on Saturdays 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.6 2. 2.2.6, 2.2.1 and appendix E 3. 2.2.1 4. 2.1.3 5. Tavern removed, 2.2.3 6. 2.2.1, see conditions in DA 088-05-08 7. 2.1.4 8. 2.2.3 – would be

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		7. This is a residential area 8. Limits should be placed on noise, type and scale of development	conditioned
S	59 W Moase	1. Improvements to foreshores and walkways around Blackwattle and Rozelle Bays have removed eyesores and made the foreshore more accessible 2. Service road will need to be improved	1. Noted, 2.5 2. 2.4.1
O	60 M Dent	1. Noise from Liquidity 2. Noise travels over water 3. Impose standards of entertainment venues within residential areas	1. Noted 2. 2.2.6 3. 2.1.1, 2.1.4
O	61 J Spring	1. Concerned about further expansion of on-water facilities of the superyacht marina 2. Concerned that shops will increase boats when they row between 5-8am weekdays and 5-10am weekends	1. 2.9 2. 2.9
O	62 A Wood	1. Unsatisfactory community consultation 2. Establishes a massive entertainment precinct 3. Ignores other proposed development in the area 4. The tower is an unacceptable advertising sign	1. 2.3.1 2. 2.1.1, 2.1.3 3. 2.6.2, 2.4.1 4. 2.7.4
O	63 G Barnes	1. Noise (Liquidity)	1. Noted – 2.2
O	64 L & P Patsalos	1. Architecturally well designed 2. Noise (Liquidity) 3. Oppose outdoor entertainment after 7pm Sun-Thurs and 10pm Fri-Sat	1. 2.7 2. 2.2 3. 2.2.3
O	65 M Rehkopf	1. Transformed into an entertainment area 2. False claim of consultation 3. Past noise complaints 4. Noise assessment is amateurish	1. 2.1.3 2. X2.3.1 3. X2.2 4. 2.2.6 appendix G
O	66 H Do	1. Potential noise problems	1. 2.2
O S	67 S O'Connor	1. Oppose if there is live music as set out in the application 2. Otherwise supports the proposal	1. 2.2.2 2.
O	68 J Morgan	1. Noise and scale render the development inappropriate 2. Noise in a residential area from amplified music in the evening and night will also impact on land values	1. 2.2.1, 2.1.2 2. 2.2.1, 2.1.4