

David Stillman
1G/2 Bowman Street
Pyrmont 2009

I would like to object to the proposed Hanson Concrete Batching Plant on Glebe Island. I live approximately 120 metres from where this development is proposed and it will impact greatly on my life, my home and my health.

It is an inappropriate development for this site. Glebe Island has not been a heavy industrial site for over 10 years and to return it to such a site, is a betrayal of the community by the Government. This is an ill conceived, ill considered and thoughtless decision. Port Botany is far better suited for this type of development. They are equipped to deal with this type of industrial site.

Pyrmont, the most densely populated suburb in Australia, no longer supports heavy industry. Jacksons Landing has been developed, and is continuing to be developed, as a showcase suburb and people, including myself and my family, have purchased with a view to being part of its ongoing creation and evolution. It is not in keeping with the 2000 Master Plan for the Bay Area. Pyrmont and surrounding areas have become a tourist destination, not just for overseas visitors but for locals and other Australians visiting from interstate. Does the government really want to destroy the progress it has made in creating an example of excellent reconfiguring of a dirty, ugly industrial environment? What a waste that would be!

The Hanson EIS (and the Port Authority REF) is written in technical language and as such makes it extremely difficult for the lay person to understand or comprehend. Was this intended to confuse residents? I object on the grounds that the EIS is not possible to be understood by a lay person and needs to be redone in language that is accessible to the lay person.

Whilst this submission is in reference to Hanson Concrete's EIS, it is inconceivable that the Government should separate it from The Port Authority REF and expect residents to deal with the documents submitted and thus the consequences separately. Whatever impacts are foreseen from The Port Authority MUF are the same for Hanson Concrete and as such the impacts are doubled.

From dissection done by other residents more able to understand the EIS submitted by Hansons, I understand it does not give any indications of the cumulative affect that will occur when placed alongside The Port Authority MUF and vice versa and even in isolation, the EIS figures and calculations regarding noise, light, dust, and fuel emissions are estimated to probably be above the regulated levels and 2 Bowman Street, where I live, is to be the most affected. This is acknowledged by both applicants. No definitive reading on noise, light, dust or fuel emissions has been done, and especially not from 2 Bowman Street. Why has this not been done? Is it because the likelihood is that any reading done by Hansons, will prove to be above the regulated levels? And when added to any readings done by The Port Authority, the combined levels will be so far above regulations, that the development would, under normal circumstances, not be allowed to proceed.

Bearing in mind that we have been advised to close our doors and windows and go inside and put the air-conditioning on if the noise, light, dust and fuel emissions are too inconvenient and to close our curtains/blinds against the lights, it appears that both proponents of this development well understand the impact it will have on nearby residents. I also wish to stress that the combined affects from the two facilities, Hanson and the Port Authority, will also impact on the health and well being of myself and my family. I was under the impression that I lived in a civilised society. What civilised society inflicts this on their citizens?

In no particular order I further object in relation to the following:

Noise

Living just 120 metres from any ship that is docked and operating 24/7 hours will mean that my home will be filled with the constant humming of the ship engines, of their cargo being unloaded and any truck movement. The noise will travel straight into my home. As an Australian citizen I think it is reasonable to expect, and my right, to have peace in my home, especially during the night hours when quiet is essential for a restful night.

Light

With the proposed operations to run 24/7 and the site needed to be lit throughout the night, I can assume that my home will be subject to an excessive amount of artificial light rather than natural light. This will make sleep difficult and eventually lead to stress and other health related problems.

Dust

Having had the occasional ship dock at Glebe Island I am well aware that dust particles cover my balcony during the unloading of any ship, making outside living extremely difficult. With the proposed 24/7 operation the dust problem will make using my balcony impossible. There is an expectation in this country that every resident is entitled to live with access to fresh air. This development will mean that that freedom is taken from me. The dust problem will be exacerbated during periods of high wind and the ongoing affects of dust particles could lead to various health conditions including lung disease.

Air Pollution

The ships that could be docking at Glebe Island are not modern cruise ships but cargo ships without any fuel emission restrictions. They burn fuel that emits sulphur far above the recommended levels. Again, associated health problems are likely to be experienced.

Architecture of the Proposed site

It is proposed that silos will be built which will be the same height as my building. They will be situated 120 metres from my balcony. This is unacceptable. It is also proposed that an enormous, ugly, industrial shed will be constructed again 120 metres from my home. This is also unacceptable.

Traffic Movement

The argument that Glebe Island is a suitable site because of its close proximity to building sites throughout the city area does not stand up when the proposed truck movements of the combined facility will number in excess of 5000 truck movements a day. The truck movement will clog inner west streets. The Anzac Bridge is already bumper to bumper for a considerable part of each day, including nighttime hours. The traffic light configuration does not allow for multiple trucks to move onto Victoria Road or The Crescent. The time required to move the concrete trucks from Glebe Island is not viable.

The entire Glebe Island proposal, Hanson and the Port Authority is unacceptable in every aspect. I urge the Planning Minister to reconsider the consequences to the 16,000 residents on the Pyrmont peninsula. It is beyond belief that any Government within Australian could contemplate treating its citizen with such disdain. I would expect that the very least the NSW Government could do is to treat its constituents with due respect and not subject them to ongoing stress and anxiety.

David Stillman

11 May 2018

