

Denise Anne Ball
Apt 1A, 2 Distillery Drive
PYRMONT NSW 2009

27 April 2019

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

OBJECTION

Dear Sir

I write to express my strong opposition to the proposed relocation and expansion of the Hanson concrete batching plant and bulk aggregate facility to Glebe Island Berth 1. I believe that this proposal must be refused in the public interest.

As a resident of Jacksons Landing (I live in Silk) I was led to believe that I was buying into an evolving residential area opposite a visionary recycling of an obsolete heavy port and industrial area into a high-tech innovation hub. These are wonderful ideas for a city which wishes to take a prominent place on the world stage!

On the contrary, the Hanson proposal - together with its neighbour, the proposed Port Authority MUF, would mean that I would instead be living opposite a new "Port Botany" with large-scale, intensified port and industrialised development. I wonder how you think this would reflect on Sydney's international profile – abysmally I would think!

This turnaround represents a complete breach of faith from the State Government to the people of Pyrmont, Glebe and Rozelle and **must be refused** as being an archaic, retrograde and completely inappropriate facility for Glebe Island.

Having the existing concrete plant facility "relocated" to Glebe Island as a significantly larger concrete and aggregate handling plant operating on a 24/7 basis due to the impending Sydney Fish Market redevelopment would cause major environmental and health-related issues for residents and wider communities. These consist of:

POLLUTION

air quality

massive amounts of fine dust particles in a high-wind area. Despite assurances in the Hanson EIS that bulk materials will be covered and stored appropriately, it is impossible not to have fine particulates in the air throughout day and night. I live approximately 200m from the site and have already witnessed increased levels of fine dust collecting on my apartment, possibly due to WestConnex activity in the area. This fallout would be substantially increased, should this proposal be approved.

Diesel fumes throughout the day and night from the constantly-running engines of berthed cargo ships burning sulphurous bunker diesel would also have serious health implications.

Noise

I, and much of the Jacksons Landing community, have already been exposed to high levels of low-frequency rumbling, pulsating noise from the engines of ships occasionally berthed at Glebe Island B1&2. **Such noise has already been measured by acoustic consultants as being well above EPA night-time noise limits** without any acknowledgement from the proponent in its EIS.

Many people do not realise that these engines run continuously while ships are berthed, and the noise cannot be ameliorated. As there is no proposal for the proposed concrete plant to provide shore to ship electric power, the proponent is clearly not interested in the effects on its residential neighbours. It is therefore probable that I and my family would be exposed to such high-level noise non-stop. Surely this cannot be permitted. It is draconian and would reflect very badly on your Government if it was allowed.

We are occasionally woken at night by the beeping sound of trucks reversing – another noise which is both loud and disruptive. With 24/7 operability, and notes in the EIS supporting the application that substantial truck activity will occur at night, we are expected to suffer from both high-frequency (beeping) and low-frequency (diesel engine) noise at the same time and throughout night and day. This would be a totally unacceptable outcome in a civilized society and an urban area! Are we to be treated like cannon fodder so that the Port Authority can build its Glebe Island empire?

As a health professional, I am well aware that sleep disturbances lead to serious physical and mental health issues – all scientifically proven. This threat to public health amounts to sufficient reason on its own for this application to be refused.

Traffic

Figures extrapolated from the EIS show likely truck movements along James Craig Rd and through its intersection with Victoria Rd to be in the range of 3000 – 6000 truck trips per day! Yet the EIS suggests effects on traffic would be minor! This suggestion is clearly untrue, and deliberately misleading. The impacts on cumulative noise, fumes, dust, as well as functionality of existing businesses on Glebe Island would be immense and intolerable. Facilities of this scale cannot be allowed to coexist with residential apartments and smaller-scale businesses. It would be both regressive and anachronistic for you to allow substantially increased industrial development on Glebe Island.

Also, greatly affected would be marine traffic in Johnstons Bay. An ever-increasing amount of marine traffic of all shapes and sizes move through the existing waterway of Johnstons Bay and through the narrow channel provided by the old Glebe Island bridge into and out of Rozelle Bay. The proposed location of the Hanson plant would see large ships berthed within metres of this channel. This would create congestion and potential danger to all craft maneuvering through Johnstons Bay. Another significant risk to public health and safety! I would remind you that there has already been a marine fatality through this passage. To illustrate this risk, please refer to the images attached to this submission.

These road and marine traffic impacts would be felt throughout Sydney and its harbour and not just on an around Glebe Island.

Artificial Lighting

Since the proposed facility is to run all day and all night throughout the year and within 200 metres of bedrooms of residential apartments in which many hundreds (if not thousands) of people live, sleep disturbance would be further exacerbated by artificial lighting spilling from berthed ships, the illuminated wharf, and the facility itself. This location is justified in the EIS on historical grounds – the wharf was used to deliver cars to Glebe island in the past (finishing in 2008). Based on this, Hanson claims that Johnstons Bay is a port, that it has existing-use rights, and that the proposed facility is in keeping with the history of Glebe Island. It clearly is no longer a port and no such existing usage rights should exist in such a changed context. Johnstons Bay is now a waterway.! Existing port-related rights have been extinguished by time and progress.

This historical port argument clearly belongs in the past and is no longer relevant or valid. Johnstons Bay is narrow and wedge-shaped towards the passage through to Rozelle Bay. It no longer functions as an active port and should only ever be used for occasional berthing of ships, as it has been for some considerable

time. It is a totally unreasonable and unfair proposition for waterway users and adjacent residents to convert it to a permanently-floodlit 24/7 port and thereby jeopardise the safety of other craft in the waterway and the health of all people adjacent to it.

Water Pollution

Conversion of Glebe Island to a large-scale port and industrial facility will also affect the quality of water in Johnstons Bay. Frequent berthing of cargo ships unloading bulk materials would undoubtedly lead to increased oil- and foul-water slicks in Johnstons Bay and recontamination of a waterway which has become cleaner over the years since regular and intensified port activity ceased on this side of Glebe Island (2008). Unacceptable!

SCALE

This proposal, together with the adjacent Port Authority MUF proposal, is for facilities with very substantial scale. For example, the proposed Hanson concrete plant is much larger and has a much higher annual throughput than the existing one located on the new Sydney Fish Market site. It is located on a site the size of 21/2 football fields and has structures which are 34 metres (equivalent to an 11-storey building) in height – almost as high as the existing Glebe Island Silos! Its **proposed 24/7 usage is not even currently enjoyed by the existing concrete plant on Bridge Rd and is a totally unreasonable proposition for this location!** The adjacent MUF proposal is for a building which is hundreds of metres long and 65 metres wide. Clearly, the sheer size of these proposed facilities will magnify all the environmental impacts outlined above. Totally inappropriate!

BAYS PECINCT MASTERPLAN VISIONS

Mike Baird is quoted as saying (in his Bradfield Oration) less than 2 years ago *"The industrial relic of the White Bay Power Station and surrounds will be transformed into a global centre for high-tech jobs and innovation. Glebe Island will transition from importing sand to exporting silicon"*.

"The NSW Government's ambition for The Bays Precinct is to drive an internationally competitive economy, by building world-class destinations on Sydney Harbour that will transform the city, New South Wales and Australia" (extract from the DOP&E website).

It seems we might have been sold a lie when we decided to live opposite Glebe island and we might now end up living opposite a re-industrialised, dirty, noisy, traffic-bound and polluted Glebe Island if this facility (and its neighbour) are permitted to blight the landscape.

SUMMARY

Are we to believe – as we would have every right to should this application be approved – that the NSW government is so inept and lazy, so disinterested in maintaining faith with its own stated objectives and its own electorate that it cannot find a more suitable site for the location of a large-scale industrial facility such as the Hanson Concrete Batching and Aggregate-Handling Plant than this one?

As a citizen of NSW, I and my community have a right to the peaceful enjoyment of our home and our environment which we have been experiencing for several years - long before these proposals came along! Our Government has an obligation to protect this right.

I insist that this application be refused in the public interest; that the visions and possibilities in the Bays Transformation Plan be respected and the site held over for future development which is progressive and compatible with that vision and my expectations.

Yours Faithfully

Denise Anne Ball



MARINE CONGESTION - PROPOSED HANSON CONCRETE PLANT & MUF

FIGURE 1. PREPARED APRIL 2018.

