

Contact: S.Roseland Phone: 9367 9279

15 May 2018

Att: Director – Key Sites Assessments Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001

## RE: GLEBE ISLAND AGGREGATE HANDLING AND CONCRETE BATCHING FACILITY – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the public exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the proposed Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant Facility.

Council has reviewed the available details of the proposed facility and objects to the current proposal as publicly exhibited and would like to see the following issues addressed.

# Full cumulative impact of developments and infrastructure projects around the Bays Precinct / White Bay (including traffic generation and truck movements)

The EIS must be revised to address the failure to incorporate Council's Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) request for inclusion of cumulative impacts of all developments in the Bays Precinct during both construction and operational phases, including the Glebe Island Multi-User Facility.

The proposal should take into consideration the construction of all major transport infrastructure projects in the immediate vicinity of the proposed facility over approximately the next ten years including West Connex, Western Harbour Tunnel and M4-M5 Link (should the latter two projects proceed). The possible construction of elements of the Bays State Significant Precinct (SSP) over the same period that may incorporate mixed use development including residential uses, as well as public domain connections and adaptive reuse of the State-listed heritage White Bay Power Station should also be included in the EIS to minimise and mitigate any adverse impacts upon local residents.

To achieve this Council requests the following:

 Petersham
 P (02) 9335 2222
 E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au
 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

 Leichhardt
 P (02) 9367 9222
 E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au
 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

 Ashfield
 P (02) 9716 1800
 E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au
 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131



- no access to the subject site must be provided via Robert Street, Rozelle.
- Assurance is sought that the M4-M5 Link White Bay Stabling Yard must not gain access to Robert Street under any circumstances, including relief access, due to likely additional heavy vehicle traffic in residential areas in the southern sections of Balmain Peninsula, reduced access to the cruise passenger terminal and increased conflict and reduction in safety at the Robert Street/Mullens Street intersection.
- a request for further traffic modelling be undertaken to take in to consideration all the construction and proposed major transport infrastructure projects in the immediate vicinity of the proposed multi-user facility over the next ten years including West Connex and the Western Harbour Tunnel to determine full cumulative impact and to realistically analyse the deterioration of level of service and the operation of the adjacent road network.
- a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan for the whole of the Bays Precinct should be prepared in consultation with Inner West and City of Sydney Councils to provide a coordinated and staged approach to the delivery of The Bays Precinct in a manner which minimises detrimental impacts on sensitive areas within Sydney's Inner West.
- to ensure pedestrian safety and residential amenity restrict heavy vehicles from travelling to and from the site via Annandale, Leichhardt and Forest Lodge.
- a coordination group, including representatives from the Inner West and City of Sydney Councils and Transport for NSW/Sydney Buses, should be established to oversee and advise on traffic management measures during the overlapping construction phases of the Bays Precinct, M4-M5 Link and Western Harbour Tunnel (should the latter two projects proceed).

#### Ongoing noise and air pollution

Council requests that the air and noise pollution impacts from both light and heavy vehicles and water vessels associated with the operation of the facility be minimised by requiring them to meet the highest emission standards.

#### Heritage

The Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) must be expanded to identify and describe the impacts on the remaining elements (including potential elements) of the former (first) Glebe Island Bridge, its embankments and potential archaeological evidence, including a site plan with proposed new structures overlaid on a drawing of existing state significant items.

All fabric of state heritage significance associated with the both the former and current Glebe Island Bridge should be conserved and opportunities should be explored for erection of heritage interpretation.

Clustomer Service Centres

 Petersham
 P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au
 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

 Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au
 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

 Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au
 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131



The significance of the potential archaeology has not been adequately addressed. It is unclear why the first bridge has such a low level of significance in relation to the second bridge, yet both created a major route to the Sydney markets. The level of heritage significance ascribed within the HIS (Appendix C) to the former Glebe Island Bridge given its historical, technical and associational significance should be reviewed and revised.

#### **Glebe Island Bridge**

The EIS must be revised to address the permanent re-opening of the Glebe Island Bridge for an active transport route between Balmain/Rozelle and Pyrmont/Sydney CBD.

# Further investigation of foreshore public access arrangements for the site be incorporated into the final proposed design

Public access to the Sydney Harbour foreshore and increasing access are stated objectives for both Council and the NSW government, including within Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 26 – City West.

Council requests that the final proposed design examine opportunities to allow for public access to the Harbour foreshore, for both pedestrians and cyclists, minimising the alienation of the community from the foreshore while ensuring the potential operations of the facility are not compromised and public safety is ensured.

Should you wish to further discuss this submission please contact Steve Roseland, Senior Strategic Planner on 9367 9279 or email steve.roseland@innerwest.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely,

Der.

David Birds GROUP MANAGER – STRATEGIC PLANNING

et for a sentres

 Petersham
 P (02) 9335 2222
 E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au
 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

 Leichhardt
 P (02) 9367 9222
 E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au
 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

 Ashfield
 P (02) 9716 1800
 E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au
 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131

# **WINNER WEST** COUNCIL

Meeting:	COUNCIL
Meeting Date:	8/05/2018
То:	Group Manager Strategic Planning (Birds, David)
Subject:	Glebe Island Aggregate Handling and Concrete Batching Facility - Environmental Impact Statement

## Motion: (Macri/McKenna OAM) Item No. 3 (C0518)

### THAT Council:

- 1. Endorse a submission to the Department of Planning and Environment objecting to the following:
  - a) The EIS must be revised to address the failure to incorporate Council's Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) request for inclusion of cumulative impacts of all developments in the Bays Precinct during both construction and operational phases, including the Glebe Island Multi-User Facility and Western Harbour Tunnel;
  - b) The applicant's intersection analysis must be revised to include and take into consideration traffic generated by the M4 – M5 link heavy vehicle stabling facility and the Glebe Island Multi-user Facility as these impacts must also be addressed in order to realistically analyse the deterioration of level of service and the operation of the adjacent road network;
  - c) Assurance is required that Robert Street will not be used to provide any access, including relief access, for the concrete batching works as it is totally unsuitable for such use and would reduce access to the cruise passenger terminal, reduce access to parts of Balmain East, increase conflict and reduce safety at the Robert St/Mullens Street intersection;
  - d) The Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) must be expanded to identify and describe the impacts on the remaining elements (including potential elements) of the former (first) Glebe Island Bridge, its embankments and potential archaeological evidence, including a site plan with proposed new structures overlaid on a drawing of existing state significant items. All fabric of state heritage significance associated with the both the former and current Glebe Island Bridge should be conserved and opportunities should be explored for erection of heritage interpretation;
  - e) The EIS must be revised to address the permanent re-opening of the Glebe Island Bridge for an active transport route between Balmain/Rozelle and Pyrmont/Sydney CBD;
  - f) The level of significance ascribed within the HIS (Appendix C) to the former Glebe Island Bridge given its historical, technical and associational significance; and
  - g) Further investigation of foreshore public access arrangements for the site must be incorporated into the final proposed design and confirmation must be given that the proposed works will not preclude future foreshore access and connections.

- h) Minimise the air pollution from heavy and light vehicles and water vessels associated with the operation of the facility by requiring them to meet the highest emission standards;
- i) To ensure pedestrian safety and residential amenity restrict heavy vehicles from travelling to and from the site via Annandale, Leichhardt and Forest Lodge.
- 2. Write to the relevant NSW Ministers re-stating commitment to the permanent reopening of the Glebe Island Bridge for active transport as included in the inner West Council Integrated Transport Plan and Urban Growth's Bays Precinct Transformation Strategy (pgs. 22 and 52);
- 3. Retains support for full public access to the Harbour Foreshore; and

4. Opposes the proposal which will mean significant air and noise pollution impacts unacceptable numbers of heavy vehicles using local roads and a complete alienation of the community from the foreshore.

Motion Carried	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna
For Motion:	OAM, Passas, Porteous, Stamolis and Steer
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Cr Raciti