

14 May 2018

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

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

Dear Mr Lusher

I am writing to you to lodge my strong objection to Hanson's proposed Concrete Plant on Glebe Island. The Glebe Island is not an appropriate site for the development as it is now one of the most densely populated residential areas.

The proposed Hanson Concrete Plant will have significant environmental impacts, contributing to air, noise, light, water and dust pollution. In addition, the traffic congestions in Pyrmont and surrounding suburbs will be severely impacted:

- Noise pollution appears to be extremely significant based on the predicted outcomes, readings and measurements already taken. The major contributor is the ships running their engines continuously while coming in/out of the berth, as well as at dock especially without ship-to-shore. It is undeniable that the sleep disturbance noise-levels will exceed maximum limits, albeit the report arguing that the exceedance is negligible. The argument that an exceedance is deemed negligible (or allowed to be easily deemed negligible) would evidently be against the spirit of the law. This suggests that the EIS takes the maximum limits very lightly which is not acceptable. In addition, measure should be taken on/from residential areas – rather than any location on the Streets. The EIS does not specify the exact location (ie. street number) of where the measurements/readings were taken which results in questionable predicted outcomes/impacts on residents.
- Light Pollution will hugely impact the usual sleep patterns of local residents. It is unfair for residents to be exposed to lights (with no specific limit being set) throughout the night. This will affect sleeping conditions thus the overall health and wellbeing for all residents (particularly elderlies and young children).
- Air pollution caused by emission from ships and trucks. Ships docked are required to have their engines running continuously while berthed and during the unloading of bulk materials. The diesel fumes will also travel to neighbouring areas including residential and nearly open parklands.
- Dust pollution from the unloading of bulk materials will be inevitable. This is particularly concerning as the release of fine dust particles into a densely populated residential area will hugely impact the health of local residents over long term exposure.
- Water pollution predominantly driven by the emission from ships. The EIS does not contain water-based mitigation measures (there appears to only be consideration of mitigation measures for land-based impacts). The fact that the Port Authority/Hanson cannot address nor have control over the

environmental impact from the marine activities (such as the type of ships, and type of crude diesel used to run engines, and its sulphur emissions level etc) should exactly be the reason why this proposed development should not proceed (rather than proceeding and disregarding such significant issues).

- The significant level of ships either docked or manoeuvring will impact marine safety. It is important to note that Jones Bay currently already services a diverse range of craft (eg. yachts, kayaks/dragon boats, cruise vessels, and ferries, etc). This significant increase in marine activity will increase the risk of collisions and risk of accidents especially due to the narrowness of the waterways.
- Traffic congestions will be extremely severed due to the number of expected deliveries and truck movements. This will have a significant impact on traffic conditions for all areas linked to James Craig Rd, Rozelle, Blackwattle Bay, Pyrmont, Anzac Bridge as well as CBD.
- The Concrete Plant lacks 'design' which will adversely impact the aesthetics of the overall Glebe Island and its surrounding areas. This is evidently against the 2000 Master Plan and Bays Precinct's planned future for the area.
- The cumulative impacts of the Hanson Concrete Plant and Port Authority Multi-User Facility appear to be completely omitted. This is unacceptable as the combined effects of the 2 major proposed developments will clearly worsen the outlined environmental impacts tremendously. Is Hanson/Port Authority (and its EIS/REF respectively) intentionally omitting the consideration of the cumulative effects of both proposed developments? What would be the results of the assessments/measures/readings if both proposed developments were to go ahead? It is unfair and unjust to propose 2 significant developments of such a great scale, without proper consideration and assessment of the combined consequences and impacts of both.
- Whilst Glebe Island has continue to be a working port (occasionally) throughout the past decade, the activities and operations were not on a 24/7 basis. Thus, the ability and suitability for Glebe Island to be transformed back into a heavy industrialised working port is highly questionable.

Overall, the environmental impacts of Hanson Concrete Plant and its 24/7 operation will immensely impact the everyday life of local residents in Pyrmont and its surrounding suburbs and areas.

## Conclusion

The proposed development with their 24/7 operation would create significant noise, light, air, dust, water pollution which will have significant inevitable negative impact of health and wellbeing of residents in Pyrmont. In addition, there will be serious consequence on the traffic congestion from the excess amount of daily truck movements. **On this basis I strongly object the proposed development and believe that it should not be allowed to proceed.**

Yours sincerely,

Tammy L.