

OBJECTION to the Proposed SSD Application Number 8544 - Glebe Island Aggregate Handling and Concrete Batching Facility by Hanson / Hymix

This submission objection is provided on behalf of 4 specific residents of Refinery Drive Pyrmont our families and friends.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our concerns regarding the above proposal. This proposal seeks to collocate with the Proposed Glebe Island Multi Use Facility proposed by the Port Authority of NSW to which we also strongly object.

As Department of Planning and Environment is responsible for considering the appropriateness of this proposal we ask that you please give serious consideration to our concerns and that of our many neighbours and not approve their application.

The basis of our objection is the following considerations:

Living in Pyrmont / Jacksons Landing immediately adjacent to the area of Glebe Island proposed for this facility we can confirm that many of the assertions in the Hansen proposal are inaccurate or out of context.

It is true that historically the island was a heavy shipping industrial site. Now a small part of the island on the north side still carries this function. Since 2008 the island has been sporadically used as a staging post or temporary home of a variety of facilities none of which have anything like the impact of the facility proposed. The whole environment around Glebe Island today is so very different to what it was historically, even from 2008 when the proposed land was last used for bulk shipping purposes.

The Hansen application notes that the residences in Pyrmont faced *"higher accoustic attenuation standards at their DA stage in light of their proximity to a 24 hours operational port facility."* I was not here then and that may be true but it was the DA period and to put this in context the majority of the buildings in the immediate area affected were not constructed and completed until after 2008 which is when the proposed site on Glebe Island was last used for bulk shipping activity.

It was decided to move the majority of major shipping from within the harbour to Botany Bay and other locations by relevant government authorities many years ago. Why would those same authorities now consider the reinstatement of this heavy industrial activity as suitable in what is now a high density residential area? If this proposal is agreed to proceed to next stage of consideration we anxiously await the Environmental Impact assessments of both noise and pollution of both the facility and its associated shipping – not the impact for the Island as zoned but on us its nearby neighbours.

The Hansen submission notes that *"the isolated nature of the Island, surrounded by water this further mitigates potential noise impacts to nearby sensitive receivers"* and that Glebe Island is *"an operational industrial port that noise and vibration impacts are likely to be low"*. Both these comments are out of context. Glebe Island is not actually an Island nor is it "isolated" lying across a narrow waterway adjacent to one of the most densely populated areas in Australia. The part of Glebe Island that is currently an operational industrial port –is on the far side of the "island" to where this site is proposed and we are sure the residents of Rozelle/Balmain close to that active part of the island would certainly not agree with the assumption that impacts of this facility would be low if located next to them either.

The Hanson submission is astute in its appeal to Govt for the proximity to "current high profile infrastructure developments" however the fact there is a site tagged as potentially suitable just 2 km from the city does not mean it is suitable given all considerations. "Convenience" is not always the right answer to a problem such as supply of cement when the impacts on so many people and ultimately the government and the health system are detrimental and ongoing for years to come.

Since 2008, the State Government has approved the extensive residential development of the area of Pyrmont most affected by this proposal – known as Jacksons Landing and this area is now one of the most densely populated in the state. It is responsible for considerable and recurring, stamp duty contributions to the State Government. We understood that Glebe Island is an active deep water port on its north side and that the south east side has not been used for bulk carrier activity since before many of the residential buildings were even started. This area now has thousands of residents who enjoy the open space, parks, bbq areas and other facilities. The age demographic is beautifully mixed from young professionals, young families, teenagers together with more mature residents and retirees. The area is pet friendly so it is common to see all ages mingling together while walking their dogs and exercising outdoors. Pyrmont Jacksons Landing is a great example of urban renewal – from old polluted industrial to clean green residential - planning and redevelopment – an example of which the state and local government should be rightly proud. Please don't destroy your own good work.

The health and well being of all those residents are now being put at risk if this proposal and the Port Authority submission for Glebe Island Multi Use Facility are allowed to proceed. The air quality, noise, environmental and lifestyle will all be impacted by the proposed operations.

Not only are there residences, there are children's playgrounds, picnic and bbq areas that are constantly utilised directly across the narrow waterway to the island.

Recreational kayaking, canoeing, dragon boat racing, outrigger racing, yachting and boating have all flourished in recent years – these will be severely and negatively impacted with the constant docking of large ships and the requisite tug boats in the relatively narrow water way.

Cruise ships, and their visitor activities and subsequent tourist dollars spent in Sydney will also be negatively impacted as they compete for waterfront access – sharing a relatively small bay with a number of bulk carriers coming and going daily. Imagine the queues of buses departing from White Bay with their visitors competing with the 25 plus trucks per hour from Glebe Island – not a nice way to be introduced to Sydney - so how long will they continue to come here?

To give a real example, when one bulk haulage ship was in for several days early in the new year when the Port Authority seemed to be trialing the activity – the black dust evident in my home was significant and obvious just from the few days this ship was in port – and that was the air we were breathing..

A recent report published in the newspaper talks of the immediate need to change the pollution controls on bulk haulage shipping due to the proven increased premature deaths and health issues in residents living close to shipping lanes and ports. **(copy attached)** Again I submit it is inconceivable you would consider allowing this facility and the bulk haulage shipping proposed with so many children and residents in such close proximity.

To ship the quantity of cement this proposal outlines will require hundreds of trucks per day. Add those to the up to 600 trucks per day proposed by the Port Authority Multi Use Facility. It is planned that these truck spill out onto already congested major traffic and bus transport routes around Anzac Bridge and Victoria Road and City West Link.

Another real life example is - I personally was nearly wiped out in my car by a B Double bulk haulage truck whilst accessing Anzac bridge from the Balmain side very recently so I fear for all road users given the significantly increased number of trucks in that already overcrowded road system.

The Hanson application states bringing the aggregate etc in by ship will help remove 65000 trucks per annum from regional roads – only to be replaced by continual large ship pollution for thousands of residents and **hundreds of Concrete trucks per day** joining some of the highest traffic roads and intersections in NSW.

The Hanson submission states the revised Bays Precinct Plan for Glebe Island shows intermediate inclusion ie 2020 – 2022 however then goes on to suggest it be granted a 20 – 30 YEAR LEASE of the Glebe Island site by the Port Authority – which does not bode well for the success of the Bays Precinct improvement plan and renewal of the waterfront areas including Glebe Island. Hanson is proposing moving and consolidating its two operations from either side of the Fish Markets to Glebe Island as a “convenient” location for easy supply of concrete to government and other infrastructure and building projects. It is convenient to the projects but it is NOT appropriate given its proximity to such a densely populated area and its environmental and health impacts.

Hansen and their subsidiary Hymix are moving because of the NSW Government Bays Market Precinct vision of urban renewal and reuse – providing greater public access to the harbour foreshore and more green space and better facilities.

It is intended that Glebe Island be included in the Bays Precinct renewal project – moving the cement facilities around the corner onto Glebe Island as they have proposed will impact thousands of residents on a 24/7 on going basis not just for any individual projects duration but for years to come and that would be intolerable.

Moving the bulk haulage shipping and this plant as was done previously with other major shipping to Botany Bay or a significantly less populated coastal location would be a better solution and whilst transporting of the cement would take a little longer it would not be that much longer and the overall cost to the government would be much less than the ongoing health cost of the thousands that would be affected if it is moved to Glebe Island.

All major infrastructure projects get complaints and it can be insufferable for local residents whilst each activity is underway. However, when each project finishes the angst moves to another location and the next project also for a short term. Approval of this submission ensures our suburb will suffer for its entire duration – 20 – 30 years which Hanson say is a suitable lease time.

I was so enjoying the idea of living happy and healthy in Sydney much longer than that.

Sydney is growing and there is large infrastructure and development projects on the go that need support of bulk goods we understand that. Moving them by road is not ideal whether from Glebe Island or a Quarry but is a facility so close to the city centre with its associated traffic, high density residential, recreational, tourist and visitor activity impacts really the best location available?

Please do not approve this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration of our objections.

Harmful ship emissions set to halve by 2050

The International Maritime Organisation plans to halve greenhouse gas and sulphur emissions by 2050. [Read the full story](#)

Shared from [ABC app](#)

