

David S. Wilkins

Mobile: 0411 186 752

Email: dwilkins@bigpond.net.au

Unit 403 'Watercrest'

38 Refinery Drive

Pymont

N.S.W., 2009.

4 May 2018

To:

Department of Planning and Environment

Re: Glebe Island Industrialisation

I strongly object to the following proposed industrial installations on Glebe Island:

- A. the Multi-Use Facility (MUF) proposal by Ports Authority of NSW (PA);
- B. the Hanson proposal for a concrete batching plant.

My reasons are:

1. The proposals are both contrary to the 2015 Bays Precinct Transformation Plan.
2. Earlier planning for Glebe Island was for an 'innovation precinct'. These proposals are clearly contrary to that.
3. The proposed 24/7 works on the island would be a mere 150-200 metres across the water from major Jackson's Landing dwellings, part of the most densely populated suburb in Australia.
4. This means that thousands of residents will have their daily lifestyle disturbed 24/7 and particularly their SLEEP AT NIGHT caused by:
 - Noise from unloading of the ships;
 - Noise from the Glebe Island operation itself;
 - Noise from the movements of trucks receiving the ships' cargo;
 - Noise from the ships' constant engines and generators, even when not unloading. This is of HUGE concern at night time during sleeping times;
 - Industrial flood lighting of Glebe Island to facilitate off-loading of ships' cargo and on-land operations at night will seriously interfere with the sleep in hundreds of neighbouring apartments and thousands of residents.
5. Ship noise cannot be controlled by either PA or Hanson.
6. Apparently shore to ship power is out of the question so ship generators would operate 24/7.
7. Sound directly across water is amplified.
8. Dust pollution from unloading of ships' cargoes will occur 24 hours a day.
9. Dust and noise would be multiplied when two ships are operating simultaneously.
10. Dirty and unhealthy ship emissions from its funnel would create a health hazard to thousands of nearby residents.
11. The inevitable reversing truck beeps are piercing and could occur 24 hours per day despite PA saying all truck movement would be forwards. Such a statement is both unrealistic and cynical.
12. The operations would create a **public nuisance**, causing:
 - Interference with the quiet enjoyment of over a thousand neighbouring residences.

- There would be increased risk to the health and wellbeing of Pyrmont residents, particularly those (but not limited to) neighbouring Glebe Island.
13. Pyrmont has become the most densely populated suburb in Australia since about 2010 so these proposed industrial plants will interfere with a huge number of residents.
 14. Jones and Johnsons Bays can no longer be classified as a high industrial working harbour locations since the demolition of the CSR site in Pyrmont in the 1990s and the subsequent urban renewal of the site to create Jacksons Landing. That urban renewal was approved by both local and State governments.
 15. Last century Glebe Island was used for transiting imported cars. The removal of this Glebe Island use was part of the urban renewal plan BUT to now have two new 24/7 industrial plants would be both contrary to the urban renewal plan and also the plan to modernise and de-industrialise the harbour.
 16. It is invalid to argue that the working harbour concept of over a hundred years still applies to today. The active encouragement of urban renewal with its high residential occupation of the harbour shores belies this.
 17. Both proposed industrial buildings would be eyesores that hark back to the 20th century industrial Sydney landscapes.
 18. Mention has been made of the Hanson proposition being a 20 year transition plan. It is beyond doubt such transition would become permanent.
 19. The truck movements related to both PA and Hanson would be considerable and would undoubtedly cause chaos on the neighbouring road network and Anzac Bridge, already heavily used.
 20. The increased water traffic congestion created by the industrial cargo ships and tugs would create dangers to the many other craft (pleasure boats, canoes, fishing boats, dragon boats, party boats, leisure craft etc) entering and exiting Blackwattle and Rozelle Bays via the narrow pass under Glebe Island bridge.
 21. Increased water pollution is likely, and inevitable if there is a marine accident of any kind in such a restricted and crowded zone.
 22. The PA appears to have ignored the explicit requirements of the EP&A Act 1979 in relation to environmental impacts from the proposed MUF.
 23. If the PA MUF proposal goes ahead it should, as a minimum, be subject to the control of an Environment Impact Study with appropriate conditions to protect the lifestyle of neighbouring residents.
 24. PA were arrogant and cynical during their so-called public information meetings by dismissing fears of noise and pollution with the response: 'You can close your windows'. There was no such advice on the use of balconies. Every one of the hundreds of units facing Glebe Island have balconies.
 25. Such PA arrogance and unconcern for foreshore residents arises from the almost total independence of PA, a statutory body that is currently empowered to **make** proposals, **assess** those proposals and **decide** them. The enabling legislation needs to be amended to place SOME control (at least EIS control) over PA. Without that, PA rides roughshod over the harbourside residents.

Please do not let these proposals proceed.

Instead, convert Glebe island into parkland for general public use.

David Wilkins