

Proprietors of Strata Plan 80937
2 Bowman Street
PYRMONT NSW 2009

13 March 2013

The Director- General
Department of Planning & Infrastructure,
GPO Box 39,
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attn: Ms Sara Roach - Major Projects Assessment,

Dear Sara,

**RE: SSD 5589_2012 - GLEBE ISLAND EXPO
CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A TEMPORARY SYDNEY
INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AND EXHIBITION PRECINCT**

We refer to the above proposal and in particular to our previous submission dated 11 December 2012 in response to the public exhibition in November and December 2012 and the applicant's *Response to Submissions Report* that is currently on public exhibition.

Whilst clearly we are aware of the opportunity to comment on the applicant's latest report, we are concerned that despite having made a previous submission we received no letter or other formal notification of the latest exhibition!

As indicated in our previous submission, generally we are not opposed to this temporary development provided it is only for an operational period of three years and does not set a precedent for future development of Glebe Island. We strongly support integrated strategic planning for the Bays Precinct and reject the hitherto piecemeal approach taken by the previous Government to development in this locality. Nevertheless, we identified 3 areas of concern that needed to be fully addressed in the final development. Those areas of concern related to visual impact, lighting and noise.

We have now reviewed the applicant's *Response to Submissions Report* and its appendices in some detail. We note that the design of the project has been amended and that the revised plans now provided represent the proposal by the successful tenderer and will therefore more closely reflect the final development rather than the original concept. In essence we feel that the modifications to the design and layout are an improvement. We also acknowledge that whilst the existing lighting towers

on Glebe Island to not comply with current standards for obtrusive lighting, the proposal does not involve any additional lighting that would exacerbate the existing situation.

Despite these improvements, we nevertheless remain concerned that two of the issues we have raised in relation to likely impacts on residents of our building from operations of the facility have not been adequately addressed in the applicant's response. We set out below our concerns in relation to each of these matters.

Visual Impact

We previously expressed concern that Pymont residents will look out on the back of this temporary facility including the 'back of house' of the temporary structures, which will house services including WC/mechanical facilities, toilets, waste area, external storage area, loadings area and a vehicle drop-off zone. Whilst the back of the site was to be fenced off, no details of fencing were originally provided and no softening by planting or other measures was indicated. We previously requested that trees/shrubs be placed along the fence on the south-eastern side to provide some softening of what will undoubtedly be unattractive amenities and service areas.

Whilst we raised this concern in terms of the impact on the outlook for residents of Pymont, in fact this will be a view from important areas of the public domain including the thousands of motorists, pedestrians and cyclists traversing the Anzac Bridge daily. The applicant's response to this concern is dealt with on page 65 of their report. That response identifies that less "back of house" will potentially be visible because of the amended development layout. We do acknowledge that change as beneficial. However, to suggest, as the report does, that a 1.8m high mesh fence alone will provide appropriate screening is unrealistic.

Given the relative height of the Anzac Bridge and our building as well as others in Jacksons Landing, a fence, or even tree planting will do little to improve the appearance of this service area unless it is properly maintained. Because of the importance of this vista from the public domain, we expected that the applicants would provide a photomontage of the proposed facility from one or more of these locations in order to properly gauge its likely visual impact. They have failed to provide any 3 dimensional representation of the likely appearance of the proposal from these locations.

Accordingly, we repeat our earlier request that if the development is approved, at the very least a condition should be imposed requiring Plans of Management (PoM) to be prepared and implemented to ensure regular cleaning and maintenance of these service areas and to prevent the accumulation of any rubbish or other unsightly material. That PoM should include details of a contact person to respond to complaints and require maintenance of a *Complaints Register* to detail actions taken. Again, we would respectfully request the opportunity to comment on any draft PoM.

Noise

In our previous submission we raised a particular concern of residents in relation to the potential for unacceptable noise from truck and forklift or the like movements, particularly reversing vehicles at night. Most operational activities and the construction activities are not proposed to occur at night. Therefore our concern primarily relates to the so-called “bump in/bump out” activities involved in the setting up and dismantling of the various exhibitions.

We previously asked that the Traffic Management Plan ensure that delivery trucks do not have to reverse into delivery bays, but are required to drive only in a forward direction whilst on the site. If reverse movements are required by forklifts or similar they should be confined to within the structures, particularly if occurring at night.

As we indicated in our previous submission, it cannot be overstated how intrusive the reversing indicators are. In August 2009, after several complaints from residents in the surrounding areas, the NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change enforced noise restrictions on the then Inner West Busway project site on James Craig Road, which is immediately south of proposed Car Park D. The noise was caused by vehicles’ reversing alarms operating late at night and in the early hours of the morning. The reversing alarms could be heard by the DECC/EPA staff over the phone, as one of the residents of our building can testify.

Sundays are important to the residents of the surrounding areas. Construction and industrial noise during business hours is the norm during the week e.g. from the shipyard next to Maritime NSW on James Craig Road, or the construction of the Cruise Passenger Terminal or, in the past, building construction in Jackson’s Landing. However, Saturday afternoons and Sundays are traditionally quiet.

Our concern over this noise nuisance has been highlighted by our experience with such vehicles involved in construction activities for the Cruise Passenger Terminal at White Bay. That facility is more distant from our building than the proposed Expo buildings and yet the noise we experience from reversing beepers even during the day is intrusive. Fortunately those construction activities do not occur during the night. If they did so, we are quite certain that they would result in sleep disturbance given the significantly lower ambient noise levels at night. Under these circumstances, we are sure you will readily understand our concern about this aspect of the proposal.

We note with interest at page 8 and pages 43 to 44 of the applicant’s *Response to Submissions Report* that the EPA recommends that “bump in/pump out” of events is only to occur during standard construction hours (i.e. Monday to Friday 7am to 6pm, Saturday 8am to 1pm) and no work on Sundays or public holidays.

We further note the applicant’s response to the noise concerns from residents contained at pages 63 to 64 of their *Response to Submissions Report* simply refers to the supplementary Noise Impact Assessment being Appendix B. We have reviewed Appendix B and draw to your attention that there appears to have been no consideration given by the acoustic consultants to

our submission and to this specific concern about noise at night from reversing beepers. None of the submissions identified in the report would appear to correlate with our submission!

In our opinion the applicant's proposed mitigation measures in relation to this issue, set out at page 82 of the *Response to Submissions Report*, are patently inadequate. In circumstances where the likelihood of a non-compliance with the relevant acoustic standard has been identified in the applicant's own acoustic report (see last dot point at page 28 of Appendix B), the response suggested of having "all trucks to operate at the premises in a forward direction **where possible**" (emphasis added) is unreasonable and unenforceable. Who will be the adjudicator on whether or not only forward movements are or are not "possible"? How can this possibly be policed or enforced.

We note that the acoustic report suggests reversing alarms are modified or of a particular type to avoid noise nuisance. No doubt this was assumed to be the case for their modeling of predicted noise outcomes. Despite that, the predicted noise level exceeds the relevant standard at Refinery Drive, being the nearest reference point to our building. However we are concerned about the practicability of this suggestion as it would seem unlikely that the proponent would be able to control all vehicles accessing the site to deliver goods or setup displays.

It is our respectful submission that this proposed mitigation measure is totally inadequate. If the applicant is unable to operate in a manner that prevents the use of reversing beepers at night, the condition suggested by the EPA to prohibit such activities outside normal construction hours is the appropriate response.

In summary, we repeat that we are not opposed to this temporary development provided it is only for an operational period of three years and does not set a precedent for future development of Glebe Island. We do however have concerns that the issue we raised in relation to noise at night from the vehicle movements associated with the bump in and bump out of exhibitions have not been adequately addressed. We therefore strongly support the restriction proposed by the EPA that no such activities be permitted at night.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the applicant's *Response to Submissions Report* and look forward to any approval for the project being appropriately conditioned in the manner that we have suggested so as to minimise the adverse impact of the proposed temporary facility on the public domain and surrounding residential properties.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Fletcher". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "J" and a long, sweeping underline.

Proprietors of Strata Plan 80937