

My wife and I are residents of Jacksons Landing and the complex in which we live is just across the water from the proposed development.

The Concrete Batching facility proposal is not one which can be viewed with either equanimity or acclaim and our concerns are not assuaged by glib and 'touchy feely' utterances such that Sydney Harbour is a working harbour. Raw sewage used to be dumped into Sydney Harbour but we do not do that anymore. The development of a major industrial site in the middle of high density residential living, not just existing but planned, is a major disappointment to affected residents. It is not what one is entitled to expect in the 21st century from responsible government and planning authorities. Although the law of estoppel may not bind the Crown and public authorities, it is nonetheless the case that government at the state and local level has approved and encouraged high density residential apartment living in areas surrounding and adjacent to Glebe Island. Indeed, even more residential development is planned following the relocation of the Sydney fish market. It is the antithesis of sound planning and environmental policy to locate a major industrial complex in the middle of extensive existing and future planned residential living.

The proposed development is not a minor one. The visual and lighting impacts are self-described as high. The photomontage depictions from Waterfront Park clearly highlight the horrific scale of the development. The proposed development should not be approved and should be moved to Port Botany.

If, contrary to the wishes of most affected residents, the facility is to proceed, then the most stringent and best designed safeguards must be adopted to ensure the care of residents and the preservation of the amenity of a residential neighbourhood.

It is noted that the storage of materials such as aggregate, sand and cement and the like is to be housed under cover. Noise and dust from the concrete batch mixing works must be completely contained as in a noise and dustproof sarcophagus in line with world best practice as, for example, in the Port of London. It is not clear to me whether the proposal meets this requirement.

However, as I understand it, these safeguards are of little moment in relation to the containment of air, noise and dust and light pollution in the transfer process of materials from ship to the Facility. Indeed, it is the presence of the ships - docking, departing, with tug assistance, and unloading with attendant noise from engines and air ventilation systems and diesel exhaust pollution - which is of paramount concern.

The following are particular matters of disquiet and apprehension:

- The proposed hours of operation of the facility are clearly unacceptable; operation hours should be restricted to weekdays and night time operations banned.
- The number of ship movements should be restricted and continuously monitored in the light of noise, dust and light pollution; how many ships will be using the Facility? This critical information has not been conveyed to the public and is not in the application.
- What grade diesel fuel will ships using the Facility be permitted to burn? Given the close proximity of residential complexes completely surrounding the Facility, only the cleanest grade should be permitted.
- What controls are to be put in place to limit the running of ships' engines during their stay in port? The air ventilation systems of some ships are especially noisy. Residents will remember

with dismay the noise emanating from an arrested Korean ship in 2016 docked at Glebe Island. The fan and ventilation noise was an abomination.