

R Palmer - Unit #/15 Bowman Street, Pyrmont, NSW, 2009 12/05/2018

The Director
Key Sites Assessments
NSW Department of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY 2001

Attention: Mr Karl Fetterplace

Re: Hanson Concrete Plant application at Berth 1 and land adjacent, Glebe Island
Application # SSD 8544

SSD 8544. Berth 1 and land adjacent, Glebe Island, James Craig Road, Rozelle (lot 10 DP 11 707 10)

Applicant Hansons Construction Materials Pty Ltd
Council Area Inner West
Consent Authority
Minister for Planning

As a long-term resident of Pyrmont, I strongly oppose the above mentioned development proposal. I have lived in Jacksons Landing for over 15 years and I have been part of its development which has contributed to Pyrmont becoming the most densely populated suburb in Australia. I was a resident of Refinery Drive when the car carriers used to dock here and unload the cars and I know how much of a disruption this caused to the residents around. The decision to move this activity from Glebe Island to the more suitable Port Botany was welcomed by all, including those involved in the industry who no longer had to deal with ongoing resident complaints or the logistical issues that the site presents in terms of clogging of roads. Once the cars moved on, residents were led to believe the Bays Precinct Master Plan was going to lead to a redevelopment of Glebe Island more in keeping with its residential neighbours, for example the transformation to a technology hub. Sadly as residents (and voters) we have been sadly misled. It would appear the State Government is more concerned with heavy industrial development and the destruction of inner city living than developing an area that the city can be proud of on the world stage.

Having read the EIS, which should be noted has been written in such a way that it is almost impossible for the everyday reader (who will be impacted by this development) to easily interpret, I challenge the development for the following reasons:

Noise

The 24/7 operation of a concrete batching plant is going to produce excessive noise in a highly populated residential area. Noise is going to come from multiple sources, including ships berthed and unloading materials, processing of concrete, movement of cement trucks, beeping of trucks and other vehicles.

EIS addressing noise:

- The EIS has attempted to acknowledge these noise issues, but also conceded that it is expected the noise produced will be above acceptable limits in a residential area.
- The EIS fails to take into account the cumulative effect of the noise generated as a result of the Hanson relocation and the proposed MUF at Glebe Island.
- EIS measurements have been taken from inappropriate locations in Pyrmont that are not reflective of the height of the buildings that will be affected.
- EIS states that the noise produced from the ships is not the responsibility of Hanson to manage (ie generators running constantly) and this falls under a federal legislation. If Hanson wasn't moved to Glebe Island the ships wouldn't be there and the noise issue from the ships wouldn't be an issue, therefore to suggest this is not Hanson responsibility to address is ridiculous, this development is the trigger for the issue and as such needs to take responsibility to address.

Overall there is no consideration to the impact of the cumulative noise impacts 24/7 on residents, and while there is an acceptance that there will be noise generated, the reading of it is that locals just need to suck it up.

Air Pollution

An industrial activity such as cement production is going to produce huge amounts of dust particles, and despite the EIS stating that Hanson will ensure that all materials are covered, it's impossible to stop small particles getting into the atmosphere. As an Asthma sufferer, I'm already affected by the air quality of Sydney, which is significantly impacted when it is windy and dusty, this is only going to increase the risk of my asthma episodes happening more frequently – knock on impact to the cost to the healthcare system as I'll be taking more trips to the hospital for treatment.

The ships that will be bringing in supplies will be burning diesel 24/7 due to no ship to shore power being implemented (or willingness to do so by anyone). This is going to introduce sulphurous bunker diesel and would lead to many serious health issues for people.

As with the noise issue, the proposer is adopting the position that the issues caused by the ships are not their issue – again, if Hanson don't relocate here, there would be no ships and therefore there would be no issue.

Light

The running of Hanson 24/7 means there will be a huge increase in light pollution in the area. The development is within 200m of many large residential buildings, therefore this increase in light pollution is only going to increase the amount of sleep disturbance the residents must contend with. Again, it's not just the light produced by the Hanson plant, but also the ships moored. This was demonstrated when the Hanjiin was moored at Glebe Island (under emergency circumstances) in 2017. The increase in light disturbance, as well as noise, air quality, was huge and very noticeable to all residents.

Traffic

Suggested traffic movements obtained from the EIS are in the region of 3000-6000 movements a day. How is this sustainable on already clogged roads? It has been suggested

that given the volume of traffic on the roads the impact would be minimal, however this either suggests that the trucks introduced because of the Hanson plant will be moving at non-busy times (ie in the middle of the night) and therefore introducing more noise issues, or the figures quoted are deliberately misleading in terms of the real impact.

I thought this government wanted to reduce traffic around and in the city (in keeping with other world cities such as London) yet you want to introduce more trucks into a smaller contained space.

How can this level of truck movement be in keeping with a densely populated residential area?

Traffic also refers to marine traffic. Johnston Bay is already a busy thoroughfare of boats, both commercial and pleasure craft, introducing large container ships into this space on a permanent basis is an accident waiting to happen.

Scale

While this objection is specific to the Hanson relocation proposal, it cannot be read in isolation of the other proposed development by the Port Authority for the MUF. The size of the proposed Hanson site is significantly bigger than what they presently have, and would be a huge eyesore and totally out of keeping with its current surroundings. When you combine this with the MUF proposal, a building 100's square meters in size, the whole thing is ridiculous in such a densely populated residential area. The size of this would be considered large on many industrial sites, let alone surrounded by residential towers.

In summary, I strongly oppose the relocation of the Hanson plant to Glebe Island. In allowing this proposal to proceed shows a total disregard for the impacts on the residents, many of whom have moved to the area to support and enjoy the rejuvenation of Pyrmont and Rozelle. As a resident I have the right to enjoy a clean and pollution free residence.

There is no consideration for the cumulative impacts of the overall Glebe Island proposed developments (Hanson, MUF, Harbour Tunnel site). To try and move each proposal through an individual development process suggests an underhand move by all involved, and demonstrates a total lack of vision, ownership and integrity, at least admit there is a overall development plan for Glebe Island and stop trying to sneak things through in 'small' proposals, thinking people will not look at the bigger picture and its impacts.

Sydney should be a world class city, utilizing its world class harbour for the right reasons. We should be protecting it and the areas around it, not turning them into heavy industrial areas.

Think about what Glebe Island could be in the future, and the future is not a concrete batching plant.

Regards
Rebecca Palmer

