

**Hanson Construction Materials Pty Limited – Glebe Island Aggregate Handling &
Concrete Batching Facility SSD 8544**

**Submission by the Stephen David Rogers, Unit 3C, 2 Bowman Street, Pyrmont with
respect to the Environmental Impact Statement prepared by Ethos Urban dated 14th March
2018 in relation to the Facility.**

I am a resident of Unit 3C, 2 Bowman Street, Pyrmont. I reside at that address with my wife. Our apartment is part of the unit complex known as evolve*. The evolve* building is probably the most affected apartment building by the proposed facility.

I strongly object to the proposal to establish a concrete batching facility which is to operate 24 hours per day/7 days per week..

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

1. NOISE

- 1.1 The noise that will be generated by the facility and the associated shipping, will be at unacceptable levels. The distance from the facility to the evolve* building will be only 200 to 250 metres and the distance between the shipping berthed adjacent to the facility and the building will be no more than 150 to 200 metres.
- 1.2 The EIS concedes that the construction period noise levels and, more importantly, the operation sleep intrusive levels will be beyond the maximum levels permitted. The EIS suggests that the exceedances will relatively small and will be further reduced based on the author's understand that the facades of buildings in the Jackson Landing precinct, of which evolve* is one, were treated so as to reduce noise levels. I am unaware of that alleged treatment and clearly the authors of the EIS have not verified it. In any event, that treatment, even if it occurred, would be of little relevance to noise mitigation given much of the apartment building is glazed and that each apartment incorporates substantial open verandah areas.
- 1.3 The mitigation factor, referred to in the previous subparagraph, is of course only of any relevance to the extent that unit owners keep their doors and windows shut. With respect, it is an absurdity to propose such a means of mitigation. Are the authors seriously contending, for example, that in the summer months residents keep their doors

and windows shut and run their air conditioning all day and night in an effort to mitigate the effects of noise.

- 1.4 The EIS makes reference to noise ambience levels in the vicinity. Clearly the existing noise level needs to be assessed to fully understand the impact of the proposed activity which will increase noise levels. However, for the establishment of an ambient noise levels with respect to Bowman Street, the EIS relies on a study that is now 6 years old and where noise levels in the vicinity were measured at Refinery Drive which is some distance from Bowman Street. The ambient noise levels at Refinery Drive would be substantially higher than those at 2 Bowman Street given that location's proximity to the White Bay Cruise Terminal, the White Bay berths generally and the Glebe Island berths on the northern side of the island. Surely a proper report would require that ambient noise levels be established by contemporary studies and that at least one occur at 2 Bowman Street, Pyrmont, given its proximity to the proposed facility.
- 1.5 The EIS notes that the proposal by the Port Authority to establish a multi-user facility which will be adjacent to the Hanson Facility. It also notes that there will be associated shipping with that facility and that that facility, like the Hanson facility, will operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. While the cumulative effective is acknowledged, there is clearly no detailed predictions as to what the cumulative noise level will be. It seems clear that the exceedances that are acknowledged will be in fact greater due to the combined noise effects of both facilities and associated shipping.
- 1.6 The EIS notes the inability of the operator to control shipping noise but essentially dismisses this as being an unavoidable consequence. It is my view that the inability to control shipping noise and, in fact, the other consequences of shipping which are referred to below, are a very strong reason for the proposal being rejected. It is not a sufficient answer to simply state that the operator of the facility will do everything it can but at the end of the day, it will have limited control.
- 1.7 My wife and I have only been resident of Glebe* for some three months. In that period, for approximately 7 days, the bulk carrier, CSL Reliance, was berthed at the berth known as Glebe Island 7. I have suffered significant hearing loss which requires me to wear hearing aids. Obviously they are not worn at night. Notwithstanding my hearing loss, the noise generated from the CSL Reliance woke me up on a number of occasions. This was one vessel. The combined operation of the Hanson Facility and the Port Authority's MUL, will result in noise coming from as many as three ships berthed at Glebe Island 7 and 8 at night and from the two operating facilities. I anticipate the sleep disturbance for

me will be significant. For those residents who have no hearing difficulties, I image the affectation will be horrendous.

1.8 In short, in respect of noise I believe:

- (a) Ambient noise levels have not been properly determined for 2 Bowman Street, Pyrmont.
- (b) The EIS acknowledges that exceedances are over maximum levels but it seems clear that the exceedances will be greater than those acknowledged.
- (c) The noise generated by both the Hanson and Port Authority facilities together with associated shipping, will cause significant sleep disturbance for all residents.
- (d) Due to noise effects, the proposal should be rejected immediately or if that cannot occur, before any determination, a fully independent study be conducted of the ambient noise levels of 2 Bowman Street and the cumulative predicted noise levels of both facilities and associated shipping at that address should be commissioned.

2. LIGHT EMISSIONS

- 2.1 The evolve* building is adjacent to a park. The EIS considers that the light impact on that park will be "high" in all respects. Clearly the light impact on 2 Bowman Street will be similarly high.
- 2.2 As stated above, the facility is intended to operate on the 24 hour/7 day a week basis, ie throughout the night, and there will be associated shipping berthed there through the night.
- 2.3 As stated above, the vessels will be only 100 to 150 metres from the building.
- 2.4 I again make the point that the EIS concedes that the operator will have very little ability to control the conduct of vessels berthed, including the light that will emanate from such vessels.
- 2.5 I mentioned previously the 7 day period in which the CLS Reliance was berthed at GI 7. The light emitted from that vessel effectively lit up our apartment. In our bedroom, even with shutters closed, and blinds drawn, the effect was significant. Of course, under the proposal, there could be as many as three vessels emitting light and of course there will be the light from the two facilities as well.

- 2.6 The light impact will be extremely high and is unacceptable.

3. AIR POLLUTION

- 3.1 It is clear that there will be a significant increase in dust, fumes and other emissions from the combined operation of both facilities and the associated shipping.
- 3.2 The air quality report that forms part of the EIS appears to concede that for evolve* residents the predicted pollution levels will exceed maximum allowable levels.
- 3.3 Again I refer to the berthing of CSL Reliance. While that vessel was berthed, my wife and I had to close our balcony doors on many occasions due to the fumes being emitted by that vessel. As I understand it, there is no prospect of the vessels that will be berthed having ship to shore power so that all ships berthed will have to run their engines on a continuous basis. If the stench from one vessel was so intrusive, one can only imagine what the stench will be from three vessels berthed simultaneously.

4. VISUAL IMPACT

- 4.1 The proposed facility as I read its plans, will comprise a large shed and six silos. The total area used by the facility is understood by me to occupy an area equivalent of 2.5 football fields. Moreover, the height of the silos is said to be 34 metres and there are 6 of them. My understanding is 34 metres would be equivalent to a 10 storey building, not much less than the height of the evolve* building – and of course located only 300 metres from the building.
- 4.2 At the moment Glebe Island is flat and provides clear views to the surrounding foreshore areas which include some iconic buildings which I understand are preserved. For the residents of evolve* the views of those buildings will be lost.
- 4.3 The EIS concedes that the visual impact on residents of evolve* will be significant as that building is a sensitive receiver. What the EIS does not make reference to or acknowledge, is the visual impact associated with the ships that will be berthed adjacent to the facility.
- 4.4 The EIS makes reference to the names of the vessels that will be berthed adjacent to it. I have been able to ascertain from internet search, exactly what the vessels will look like. Again, as mentioned repeatedly, there will simultaneously be vessels berthed adjacent to the MUF facility. On any view, the proposed vessels will not be attractive. They will be large and discoloured (often rusty). The impact of this on the residents of evolve* no

more than 100 metres away and in fact the whole of Jackson's landing, who view Glebe Island will be significant and is unacceptable.

5. TRAFFIC IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The truck movements envisaged by the EIS are truly staggering. The truck movements for the Hanson facility alone are suggested to be in the 100's per hour and if fully operational , some 5,000 per day. Of course there will be substantial truck movements generated by the MUF when it is fully operational. On my reading the MUF could generate truck movements of some 2,000 per day. Hence there is a real possibility that the combined truck movements could be as many as 7,000 per day. Of course the egress from Glebe Island is one road.
- 5.2 The resultant traffic congestion from the operation of the Hanson facility alone will cause significant road congestion in the areas of Balmain, Pyrmont and Annandale. The congestion alone on the Anzac Bridge will be horrendous.
- 5.3 The EIS contends that there is a strong business case for the facility being that one vessel can bring to the facility the same quantity of materials as it would take thousands of trucks; the result being that the number of trucks on Sydney streets will reduce. A similar argument is propounded by the Port Authority as justification for the multi-user facility. However, the argument is completely flawed.
- 5.4 The truck movements that would bring materials to the various concrete sites span the entirety of the Sydney area and so the effect is dissipated. Of course, in the future with road projects such as North Connex, a series of major roads and tunnels will be completed which will take traffic off suburban streets. Of course, the result of what is propounded in the EIS will centralise all truck movements at one location causing complete gridlock in the neighbouring road network which will include suburban streets.

6. EFFECT ON MARITIME OPERATIONS

- 6.1 The Hanson facility and the associated ships berthed adjacent to it will be only a few metres from the old Glebe Island Bridge and the entrance to Blackwattle Bay. That entrance is utilised by a great number of commercial and private vessels.
- 6.2 The entrance to Blackwattle Bay is particularly narrow and as it currently stands, vessels have to navigate the entrance carefully to avoid collision. The narrowness is made worse by the structures in the pass which supported the old bridge.

- 6.3 Ships berthed adjacent to the facility will further significantly impede upon the ingress and egress through Blackwattle Bay.
- 6.4 Quite simply, in the short time that I have resided in our apartment, I have seen a number of difficult situations arise and near misses with vessels passing through. Ships berthed adjacent to the facility and in fact generally at Glebe Island 7 and 8, will significantly increase the difficulties in navigating the small entrance and significantly increase the risk of collision and possibly serious injury and death.

7. SUMMARY

- 7.1 The comments above are based upon my reading of the EIS. I have done the very best I can to understand it. I found the body of the document to be particularly difficult for a lay person to comprehend.
- 7.2 I note from the EIS guidelines it is stated that at least the EIS, and particularly the executive summary, should be drafted in plain English. This has not occurred. If the proponents still wish to proceed with this proposal notwithstanding this and other objections, then I believe that the EIS document and particularly the executive summary, need to be redrafted so that lay people can fully understand it. If that occurs, there may even be more bases for objection.
- 7.3 In any event, in what I have read of the EIS, I believe that the proposal should be rejected. The effects on the residents of evolve* and in fact Jackson's Landing, are completely unacceptable – noise emissions above maximum levels and likely to be higher, light emissions conceded to be high, negative effects from associated shipping which cannot be controlled, pollution levels above acceptable levels and the list goes on.

Yours faithfully



Steve Rogers

Resident - Evolve*

8 May 2018