

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

As a part-owner of the above apartment in Jacksons Landing, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Hanson Concrete Batching Plant and Bulk Aggregate facility at Glebe Island Berth 1. I believe that the proposed location for this facility is not in the public interest and would threaten the quality of the local environment as well as the health and welfare of residents in Jacksons Landing, Pyrmont. I therefore call for the proposal to be refused.

My major reasons for objection are set out below:

- *The proposal appears to be part of an opportunistic, regressive and anachronistic attempt to re-industrialise Glebe Island and to significantly upgrade its port functionality;*
- *The proposal conflicts with the visions and objectives announced for Glebe Island in the Bays Precinct Transformation Plan 2015.*
- *The proposal conflicts with many of the principles and provisions in the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan 2000;*
- *This is an over-scaled industrial complex sited in an inappropriate location and with unreasonable and unacceptable hours of operation.*
- *The proposed plant would create intolerable, continuous noise levels emanating from auxiliary engines of berthed ships, which would exceed EPA limits, disrupt sleep, and adversely affect public health;*
- *The proposal involves significant adverse effects on local air quality through airborne particulates;*
- *The proposal would subject residents to continuous, sleep-disturbing artificial port- and ship-lighting;*
- *The proposal would create significant public health and safety impacts in relation to existing marine traffic on the increasingly-congested Johnstons Bay waterway.*
- *The proposed facility would involve large net increases in movements of trucks in and out of Glebe Island, with significant consequences for other users of James Craig Rd;*
- *The proposal would create significant, unwanted and disruptive impacts on The James Craig Rd/Victoria Rd intersection and other local traffic accessing Victoria Rd, City West Link, The Crescent, and the Anzac Bridge.*
- *The proposal would result in unwanted and disruptive visual impacts on existing heritage and landmark structures on and across Glebe Island;*
- *The EIS supporting the proposal offers no adequate means of effective management or mitigation of many of its adverse environmental effects*
- *The proponent's EIS seems to deal with many of the real social and environmental issues involved through a strategic combination of:*
  1. *omission and devaluation of key environmental factors;*
  2. *overly-technical jargon obfuscating significant issues;*
  3. *over-use of predicted outcomes instead of **available** measured outcomes of existing precedents;*
  4. *misleading, fallacious and convenient conclusions.*



---

## CONFLICT WITH the GLEBE ISLAND and WHITE BAY MASTERPLAN 2000

The overriding planning document for Glebe Island is The Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan 2000, which outlines the goals for redevelopment of the port to improve the environmental and aesthetic impact of the port over time, while retaining its working port status. While there is no "end date" in the Master Plan, it notes that it is intended to guide planning for the next 20 years and is therefore relevant to current development.

The principles and provisions are certainly relevant to the proposed facility as they were specifically intended for any such development in this precinct.

The principles that the Hanson proposal has disregarded are:

- enhanced environmental performance;
- internal location designations for large-scale facilities (not on water's edge);
- improve the appearance of the port;
- maintain views of the landmarks which are of heritage significance - Pyrmont Skyline, Anzac Bridge, Glebe Island Bridge, existing silos;
- deliver a high standard of urban design,
- provide noise, light spill, water quality, air quality and hazard risk control measures
- **The following specific noise Assessment Criteria**

A level of 53.2 dB(A) measured indoors corresponds to a conservative level of 65 dB(A) measured outside the bedroom window assuming windows are open for ventilation. The report adopted a criterion which would ensure that 90% of the population (including the aged) are protected in their sleep an emergence level (Lavmax or L1) of 65 dB(A). This criterion applies to short-duration noises which may occur at night from the operation of the port.

**For continuous, steady or quasi-steady noise, recent evidence suggests an Leq of 40 dB(A) be used as an upper limit for assessment of sleep arousal inside bedrooms.**

## CONFLICT WITH the 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).

Clearly this proposal represents the complete antithesis of these visions and objectives, which were the catalyst for many thousands of owners in Jacksons Landing purchasing their properties here.

## SUMMARY

In my view, the proposed Hanson Concrete Batching Plant and Aggregate Handling Facility has no merit in terms of the public interest and **must be refused**. It represents a regressive re-industrialisation of a highly significant component of the Bays Precinct and conflicts with important planning objectives of the Bays Precinct Transformation Plan. The continued use of existing and expanded port facilities 24 hours per day, 7 days per week should not be at the expense of the health and well-being of local businesses and residential communities surrounding Glebe Island. Such facilities must not be allowed near concentrated residential areas under any circumstances.

Yours Faithfully



Jessica Noelle Ball  
B IntArch (hons)