

# Peter and Julie McKenna

---

10 Spotted Gum Dr  
Pokolbin NSW 2320  
Peter Mobile: 0419 419 334

12<sup>th</sup> May 2018

Mr Ben Lusher  
Director – Key Site Assessments Planning Services,  
Department of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY 2001

Dear Mr Lusher,

**Re: SSD 8544 - Glebe Island Aggregate Handling & Concrete Batching Facility**

I wish to submit comments on the EIS for the above proposed project. My wife and I own an apartment in the building Evolve in the Jacksons Landing precinct of Pyrmont and we lived there for a number of years from 2008 to 2015. At present we have it leased out, but our plan is to move back into the apartment when the current tenant's lease ends in 2019.

I wish to object to this proposal on the basis of several specific concerns over this application, which will affect our amenity of living in the apartment again next year, as well as several more general community related concerns which will impact the amenity of living in Jacksons Landing.

I would also add, that after a career in major projects in both the mining and energy industries for more than 40 years and having had to prepare, review and approve EIS's for many projects across several countries, I believe the quality of this particular EIS is quite poor and fails to properly address a number of issues:

- Virtually no options analysis is presented
  - The proponent suggests that there is a requirement for a "deep water port to enable import of bulk aggregate by sea". The current facilities do not have this feature so why do the new facilities require it?
  - If this is a requirement, then why has Port Botany not been considered, where there are no residential neighbours in close proximity?
- The ship unloading activities are almost ignored, presumably because they are trying to "piggy back" off current Ports Authority approvals. However, the ship unloading activities are such an integral part of the proposed operations with perhaps a larger potential impact on near residents that this just seems completely inadequate.
  - As a bare minimum the cumulative impact of both ship unloading and land based operations (along with the Port Authority MUF) should be considered
  - The NSW Ports Authority is proposing a new MUF on the same island which proposes to cover both Berths known as Glebe 1 and 2. Almost no information is available on this proposal but in any other instance the cumulative effects of both proposals would be required to be assessed. No such assessment is presented, so how do we even know whether there is the possibility of increased ship movements beyond the current approval?
- The noise and traffic assessments seem to be based on outdated information as the base case



- When residences such as those at the building Evolve are so close to the proposed new development, surely specific assessment of the impacts at the closest point would be required?
- I am afraid that this EIS would not have even passed internal review in the mining industry, never mind external review


However, the main reasons for my objection are related to the impacts both to us as residents of Evolve and also as residents of Jacksons Landing. These are:

- 1) Specific to our apartment at Evolve, which is in the "A" stack so are the closest residences to the proposed facility
  - a. Very close proximity to the proposed facilities, particularly the ship unloading activities. Our main living room, balcony and main bedroom look directly over the area at no more than 150m away
  - b. Noise from ships with diesel engines constantly in operation, overlain by the onshore operations of conveyors, concrete batching and truck movements.
  - c. Pollution from diesel operations of both ships, trucks and other mobile equipment. We already see black soot all over our balcony from the existing quite infrequent (3 or 4 time per year) ship activities when gypsum is unloaded at the site
    - i. Even if this proposal was to be allowed to proceed, surely **shore to ship power** would be mandatory in a modern society, as it is in many other ports around the world where residences are close at its governments are serious about reducing pollution within its constituency?
  - d. 24 hour nature of the operations impacting our ability to sleep so close to where the activities are occurring, including **noise and lights from nighttime operations** shining into our bedroom window
  - e. Impacts on our visual amenity with a new industrial activity in an area where various State Governments have declared an end to industrial uses
- 2) General concerns related to living in Jacksons Landing
  - a. The narrow waterway between Jacksons Landing and Glebe Island has thrived since more than one State Government had declared the end of the working harbour in the last 10 years. It is now frequented by dragon boats, kayaks, harbour cruise and "party" boats, as well as large yachts such as those from the "super yacht" facility on the other side of Glebe Island Bridge.
    - i. How will all these craft be impacted by the increased large ship movements that will arise from this proposal?
    - ii. Can they all be operated safely in this narrow waterway?
    - iii. Surely there needs to be a proper assessment done as part of this EIS?
  - b. This proposal is completely inconsistent with what we understood to be the objectives of the Bays Precinct Master Plan
    - i. My wife and I attended an open day at Eveleigh a couple of years ago to gain a better understanding of the Bays Precinct objectives and provide our comments
    - ii. There was no mention of any proposed industrial uses of Glebe Island, in fact quite the opposite. The talk was around possible "high tech" precincts which seems completely incompatible with this proposal and in fact, **quite misleading**
  - c. Cumulative impacts from both this proposal and the Port Authority MUF diminishing the lifestyle of all the residents at Jacksons Landing, where things like the harbour water quality had been starting to improve over several years as industrial activities wound down.

I have been a very enthusiastic supporter of the developments around Sydney in terms of both transport infrastructure and elimination of old industrial sites with appropriate redevelopment and improvement in resident lifestyles which have led to an influx of people back into the city. I hope these comments are taken positively because **I do believe that the analysis of this proposal is inadequate** and, if approved, would breach the ethos and ambience of what has been achieved to date.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment

Yours Faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. McKenna', with a long, wavy horizontal line extending to the right.

Peter McKenna

(pmmacca54@gmail.com)