

Appendix B

SYDNEY SUPERYACHT MARINA - SUMMARY OF RESPONSE TO AUTHORITIES' SUBMISSIONS

Issues Raised	Response
City of Sydney	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of impacts can only occur and recommended conditions be made only after resolution of planning process issues 	Noted
<i>Activation of consents</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure two approvals have been activated. Provide evidence of 2008 consent commencement 	3.1.9 & Appendix I
<i>Consolidation of Approvals</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagrees with consolidation of 2012 and 2008 consent. The Part 4 consent should be stayed 	Unsure whether they mean should remain or should be put on hold, given comments below
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There have been concurrent modifications to each approval for the site in the past and coordinating this is not insurmountable. Does not want obliteration of the Part 4 consent nor the flexible provisions of Part 3A 	Noted 3.4.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoids the need of "Substantially the same development" which is a cornerstone of Part 4 development. Part 4 should remain 	Noted.3.4.2
<i>Changes to approvals</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A substantial and radical transformation of the existing approvals. Area will substantially increase by inclusion of water. Intensification of land and water based works 	3.4.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic impact assessment references 12m boats not 15m 	Noted. However the error makes no difference to the traffic assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose of the development is changing by reduced size of vessels and increased numbers. Will include sale of vessels and mooring of un-identified boats 	Use of water area to remain for the mooring of vessels. Sale of vessels no longer requested.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 4 requires 24 boats of 24m or more 	This is not permissible under the existing consent SEE which requires some vessels to be less than 24m
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulatively the changes are incapable of reconciliation with the intent and terms of the original approvals particularly of the Part 4. Should do a new Part 4 DA for the marina amendments and limit s75W to matters in the Part 3A approval 	3.4.3
<i>Extent of flexibility</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too much flexibility and uncertainty in the application eg with car parking, storage, marine uses, watercraft storage, sale of vessels 	3.4.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This flexibility reduces area for superyachts, requiring more pontoons and gangways and increase vessel movements. 	3.4.3. No reduction in area for superyachts, pontoon length is less than under 2008 consent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will have different traffic, visual and noise impacts hence the impacts can't be ascertained 	3.4.3 Worst case scenarios used
<i>Surrender of Part 4 Consent</i>	

Issues Raised	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surrender at final occupation certificate stage allows for either/or, lacking planning certainty. The surrender should be upon grant of the Part 3A modification 	Not appropriate as otherwise there is no consent to continue to operate the marina prior to construction
<i>Design Quality</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not satisfy DG's Requirements for "Built Form / Urban Design". Details lacking. Buildings in perspectives are blander and lower quality than approved. Green wall elements are not documented. 	3.4.6. See landscape plans for greenwall elements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No landscaping plan lodged with the modification 	Landscape plan now provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need external colours and finishes, detailed sections and elevations, details of green wall, details of public domain treatments and landscaping 	See approved materials palette and revised landscape plans
<i>Vessel Width Restriction</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apparently there is an 18m width beam restriction through the Bridge. Development shouldn't allow vessels which have difficulty in passing the bridge. The Glebe Island Bridge will provide important low level access across the bays. 	3.4.7
<i>Consultation</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not satisfy DG's Requirement re consultation. City of Sydney and residents were not consulted prior to lodgement in accordance with NSW Planning and Environment's Guidelines for Major Projects Community Consultation 	3.1.1
Department of Primary Industries	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fisheries NSW have no objections but recommend sediment curtains are used during the on-water construction of the marina 	Recommended by P. Anink and can condition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSW Office of Water supports the inclusion of a Water Quality Management Plan as a sub-plan of the Construction Environment Management Plan 	Recommended by P. Anink and can condition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSW Office of Water encourages opportunities to establish riparian vegetation on the reclaimed land using appropriate local native plant species 	3.12
NSW EPA	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot say if an environment protection licence is required because cannot ascertain if there will be any boat construction and maintenance works, nor any details on the size of the tender boats 	3.7 and Appendix G
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If maintenance or size of tender boats exceeds dinghy size may trigger an EPL. Requests Department to facilitate discussions with proponent re this, EPA happy to assist. 	3.7 and Appendix G
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If EPL required, need assessment of noise, stormwater, fuel management, sediment disturbance, mobilisation of heavy metals within Rozelle Bay and pollution incident response management in addition to the assessments already provided 	Noted but unnecessary
Foreshores and Waterways Planning and Development Advisory Committee	

Issues Raised	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a Category 1 referral. The overall increase in bulk and scale is considered minor and will not have an adverse impact on the character of the locality when viewed from the water or nearby public spaces 	Noted
Leichhardt Municipal Council	
<i>Legality of Proposed Development</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpretation by Council staff of the Opinion of Counsel Clifford Ireland indicates that the proposed modification is beyond the statutory power to modify the Part 3A conferred by s75W and therefore the proposal is open to challenge in Class 4 proceedings in the Land & Environment Court 	No reasoning behind the conclusion is included.
<i>Bays Precinct Transformation Plan</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involves a significant intensification when plans for future management and development of the Bays Precinct is under development 	3.3.2, 2.7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compromises investigation of use of the Glebe Island Bridge as an active transport link and the adaptive reuse of the former White Bay Power Station as viable future uses may require transport connections between the Sydney CBD and the power station 	3.3.6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration should be delayed until a plan for the Bays Precinct is finalised 	3.3.2, 3.2
<i>SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensification of use on land and water will result in non-compliance with the aims of the plan and the objectives of W1 Maritime Waters 	3.3.3
<i>Number of Vessels</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased vessel movements will have a significant impact upon passive recreational use in the immediate surrounds and waterway approaches and will further privatise the Bay and limit public use 	3.3.4, 2.4.2
<i>Environmental Impacts and associated impacts on users of the existing waterway</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operation and manoeuvring of increased vessels will further disturb the seafloor which is contaminated with the potential to impact Sydney Harbour and the immediate area 	See Report of Marine Pollution Research in EA MOD1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Government and agencies need to conduct detailed sampling and analysis, identify potential impacts and incorporate appropriate measures to manage the marina operations. 	See Report of Marine Pollution Research in EA MOD1
<i>Glebe Island Bridge</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vessel numbers will increase through the Glebe Island Bridge opening. 	3.3.6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval will compromise the possibility of an independent cost benefit analysis on the retention of the Bridge and reopening of the Bridge as an active transport route between Leichardt LGA and the City of Sydney and between the former White Bay Power Station and the CBD 	3.3.6
<i>Traffic generation and parking demand during events</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional information requested for the peak event mode of the yacht club and restaurant at night time on weekdays and weekends, demonstrating likely traffic generation during this period and for bump in and bump out of events and ability to cater for the parking demand 	3.3.7, 2.3
<i>Outdoor seating</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about creation of a precinct of licensed premises with limited public transport accessibility. The modification will allow for a major 	3.3.8, 2.1.1

Issues Raised	Response
entertainment venue within a constrained industrial area	
<i>Noise implications</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensification of vessels and movements and vehicular movements and patrons of the entertainment venues including during event mode will likely see a significant increase in noise impacts on the site and surrounding residential areas of Glebe and Annandale 	2.2, 3.3.9
<i>Complexity of the Approval Process</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References previous variations made under the revoked Part 3A 	Incorrect
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 3A revoked because of lack of transparency and lack of public input and comment 	3.3.10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a “grab bag” of proposals not under the more transparent Part 4 process but by the Part 3A process 	3.3.10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invoking an unpopular mechanism to force through variations that require proper community consultation. Less, not more reliance on Part 3A should be made 	3.3.10
Office of Environment and Heritage	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater Sydney Planning Team has no interest in the matter 	Noted
Port Authority of NSW	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about ability of James Craig Road to service all the existing and proposed developments in the area, including future port developments on Glebe Island 	3.5.1 and Appendix D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is reviewing traffic assessment and modelling conducted for the application and may give further comments 	Noted. No further response was received
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overseas Passenger Terminal is in Circular Quay. The correct reference is the White Bay Cruise Terminal 	Noted. 3.5.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Berthing schedule assumptions are incorrect and underestimates the number of cruise ships – 155 ships scheduled for 2016 	3.5.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No consideration of traffic generated by the port tenants of Glebe Island which generate large truck movements on James Craig Road (Cement Australia, Gypsum Resources Australia and Sugar Australia. Not acknowledged in the EA as significant nearby land uses 	3.5.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disturbance of the seabed will require Harbour Master’s approval under cl 67 of the Management of Waters and Waterside Lands Regulations - NSW 	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Vessel Traffic Management Plan should be prepared and implemented in association with RMS and the Harbour Master 	Noted this can be conditioned
Roads and Maritime Services	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject to works being consistent with Permission to Lodge 1677 no specific concerns with the navigation aspects 	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests consideration of the impacts on the already restricted on-street parking within the vicinity 	Noted 3.6.2. Exceeds minimum numbers under the DCP.
Sydney Water	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests a condition that the approved plans be submitted to a Sydney Water Quick Check agent to determine whether the development will 	To be conditioned

Issues Raised	Response
affect any Sydney Water sewer or water main, stormwater drains and/or easement	
Transport for NSW	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues have been identified 	Noted
Urban Growth	
<i>Alignment with the Government priorities is not being achieved</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are set out in 	3.2.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSW 2021 – A Plan to Make NSW Number One 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Plan for Growing Sydney 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Transforming City Living; the Bays Precinct – Discussion Paper (on exhibition) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long Term Transport Master Plan 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use and Economic Study of “Working Harbour” in and around the Bays Urban Transformation Area (underway and under joint management from RMS, DPC, TfNSW (Maritime Management Centre) and The Port Authority of NSW) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Transport and Mobility Plan (preparation commencing shortly) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is a key destination within the BPUTP. The usage should align with government priorities and consider opportunities for the area to realise greater economic, cultural and social benefits for all 	3.2.1
<i>Upscaling of Land-Water Use and Activity</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any increase in boat storage to be considered holistically as part of the <i>Land Use and Economic Study of Working Harbour in around the Bays Urban Transformation Area</i>, the proposed <i>Transport and Mobility Plan</i> and future detailed planning commencing late 2015. 	Do not yet exist 3.2.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The above will inform assessment of safe navigation, compatibilities/conflicts of land/water use, operation of Old Glebe Island Bridge, any increase in passive and recreational water based activity. These should be factored into the Vessel Traffic Management Plan and the government future Bays Precinct Waterways Management 	3.2.2
Sydney Harbour Association (based in Rose Bay)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it an improvement under SREP (Sydney Harbour) section 2 – Aims? Don’t think anything is being protected or enhanced. Don’t think outdoor seating for commercial uses qualifies. Consider Enhancement 	3.13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows for smaller vessels. It is a self described superyacht marina so should focus on that end of the market (it appears this is based on the application for 37m boats in Rose Bay). 	3.13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tender vessels can be stored on land. Wonder why there needs to be so much allowance for this on the water 	3.13

Submissions Summary from the Public and Community Groups

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
1a	N Francis Emma St Leichhardt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rozelle Bay should be part of a working harbour but not be “overworked” 2. Is there consideration of proposed massive residential development in near future? 3. What improvements have been made to increase cars from 219 to 307 or does that rely on Westconnex? 4. More cars, more congestion, more pollution 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.4 2. Not part of this application 3. Removal of car park lifts and inclusion of 2 way ramp. 2.3.1, 2.3.2. No reliance on Westconnex. 4. 2.3. Generally within the minimum and maximum DCP parameters for car parks
1b	N Francis Emma St Leichhardt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing the number of superyachts will increase traffic 2. A superyacht marina should be built in the eastern basin of the Harbour 3. Will you be able to see the water for the superyachts? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.3.2, 2.4 2. Not part of this application 3. Area of mooring not to increase
2	G & E Hurrell	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hotel entertainment venue will have a major noise impact on a large part of Glebe based on [Liquidity]. Entertainment won't be limited to fine dining and will include lots of music. 2. Noise assessment only had sensors near the Bay but it will impact a greater area 3. Impossible to believe that windows will be closed after 10pm on summer nights 4. No effective way to monitor noise and ensure mitigation measures followed. There will be noise complaints from the club but nothing will be done 5. There are enough entertainment centres in Sydney already 6. Only a few owners of superyachts want a club and there is no demand for a club style entertainment precinct 7. The Club development will constrain residential development associated with the Bay Redevelopment Project 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Misconception there is a hotel 2. The greatest noise is at the Bay edge. The nearest sensitive receivers is the appropriate assessment point. 3. Many restaurants have this restriction in their conditions of consent and comply with them strictly. No reason to think this would not occur here. 4. Community Liaison group established. Noise conditions established in part F of the consent and not being amended. 5. 2.1.2. Not an entertainment centre. 6. Already approved – not part of this application 7. Already approved - not part of this application
3	J Rigg Paul St Balmain East	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outdoor dining and socialising areas are too big and threatens to lock out local residents from the foreshore 2. The Cruise ship berths stops many residents from accessing the foreshore 3. Fireworks from Darling Harbour disturb her dog nightly. Additional noise from 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The foreshore access provided under the consent will remain. The outdoor seating enables locals to access and appreciate the Bay in a manner not

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<p>the marina will be a very abrasive environment</p> <p>4. Supports a “living city” and reasonable foreshore development this side of the inner harbour, but yachties’ playgrounds and mass spectacle entertainment should not extend across the water</p>	<p>previously possible other than at the Fish Markets</p> <p>2. Not relevant to this application</p> <p>3. No fireworks are proposed. 2.1.2</p> <p>4. This is a berthing site for superyachts. The modification seeks to allow smaller vessels to berth. No mass spectacle entertainment is envisaged.</p>
4	Confidential	<p>1. Objects to controls by Ben White of Acoustic Logic in his noise assessment. No external music after 10pm and closing of doors and windows after 10pm is insufficient</p> <p>2. No controls on amplified music or amplified voices on yachts visiting the marina</p> <p>3. The restaurant area and yachts are on the water and will expose residents on Glebe Point Road to excessive noise</p> <p>4. She has small children and the noise restrictions will not go far enough to protect their family or neighbours from anticipated noise pollution</p> <p>5. Noise restrictions should prohibit amplified music externally at any time on the marina or on visiting yachts, that all windows and doors be closed at any time when amplified music is played. This will protect them and their neighbours</p>	<p>1. This is not being sought to be amended</p> <p>2. 2.2 They would be subject to the same noise controls relating to the whole of the development. This improves the current situation for the water where there are no noise restrictions</p> <p>3. 2.2.2, 2.2.4</p> <p>4. 2.2.1. 2.2.2</p> <p>5. Amplified music not part of this application. Noise controls in place already. External amplified music already conditioned as a trial subject to subsequent DA. 2.2.2</p>
5	M Wallace Birchgrove Road Balmain	<p>1. Increased boat traffic will jeopardise the future use of Glebe Island Bridge</p> <p>2. Outdoor seating will cause noise to local residents</p> <p>3. Boat traffic will disturb pollution in Rozelle Bay sediments</p> <p>4. Expanded development will add to road congestion</p> <p>5. Area is public land and should be available for use by the public especially open space along the foreshore. There should be a public path and cycle way from Glebe to Balmain along the shore</p>	<p>1. 2.7.2, 3.3.6</p> <p>2. 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4</p> <p>3. 2.5. 4 knot speed limit</p> <p>4. 2.3.2, Appendix D</p> <p>5. 2.1.7. 2.1.10 A public path is already approved on the site provided enabling the link from Glebe to Balmain in future when other sites are developed</p>
6	M Rehkopf 501 Glebe Point Rd Glebe	<p>1. Needs further noise testing and analysis</p> <p>2. Should use the same company as previously used to ensure consistency for new testing</p>	<p>1. 2.2.1, 2.2.2, Appendix C</p> <p>2. Done</p> <p>3. Taken into consideration in the</p>

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Need night time noise testing including yacht engine noise and yacht horn blowing when they depart Need accurate non wide angle photos from the Pavilions to see the visual impact of the current western boathouse and the proposed additional floor in the eastern building and the proposed additional massive buildings that are no in the photos There will be a significant visual impact from the extra level on the eastern building The montages do not show the change in view from the Pavilions The western boathouse is massive and has detracted from the area and it should not be used for a comparison 	<p>background noise assessments for the original application. See 2.2.2 and Appendix C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.6.1 2.6.1 Appendix C from the EA to MOD1 Views taken from public locations Noted
7	H Do 501 Glebe Point Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No noise testing and analysis undertaken of the proposed changes and close residences mean they need to be confident that the changes will not increase the noise levels. The increased size of the buildings which are already massive compared to the adjoining Maritime Services building will negatively detract from the area 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.2 and Appendix C Montage illustrates comparable size. Note that The Pavilions is 6-9 levels in height.
8a	M Teh 501 Glebe Point Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The expanded huge, noisy entertainment precinct is opposite her home. The temporary Liquidity restaurant was extremely noise and had limited hours, but this proposal appears unlimited [in hours] Inadequate community consultation, which ignores principles recommended by experts consulted re Bays Transformation Virtually doubling the number of superyachts mooring will preclude and endanger smaller craft eg rowers and dragon boats 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.3. Hours are already set out in the consent conditions 2.8.1, 3.1 2.4.2
8b	M Teh	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> As above 	
9	H Watson An apt in Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Originally supported the development but the increase in size of licensed premises and resultant disruption will turn it from a community marine facility into a Darling Harbour type of a full-on entertainment precinct. Although originally a maritime precinct the accent on music and alcohol seems to defy the original approval However would still support the original proposal but ask to consider the impact on the surrounding residential areas No consultation with the surrounding community. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> GFA of restaurants will not increase 2.1.1, 2.1.2 No amendment to music and alcohol are contained in the proposal. Alcohol will be subject to separate liquor licence provisions Noted. Assessments conducted in EA and by this Response

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<p>5. The extracts of the proposal seems misleading particularly the photograph looking across Rozelle Bay towards Bicentennial Park and the mass of housing that stretches halfway up Glebe Point Road and Eglinton Road</p>	<p>4. 2.8.1, 3.1</p> <p>5. Any such described photograph is not part of the documents of either the original proposal or the modification. The referenced photograph was shown by Save Our Bays at a meeting in a powerpoint slide</p>
10	J Buckingham Glebe	<p>1. Development in piecemeal fashion must stop</p> <p>2. Should be a new proposal or an appeal against the original approval as many of the “modifications” raise again matters that were rejected in the original approval</p> <p>3. Notification and response time given was demonstrably inadequate. Previous submitters were not alerted nor were people across the bay in Glebe Point</p> <p>4. Display copy at Leichhardt Council was not available but provided quickly by the Department</p> <p>5. Artistic impressions, photographs and models are meaningless and misleading. No 3 dimensional model available anywhere. There should have been a presentation by the architects/developer at perhaps a public forum.</p> <p>6. The fewer motorised craft in the Bay the better to avoid stirring up the contaminated sediment</p> <p>7. The Bay is perfect for non-motorised craft. Local professions such as fishing fleet, heritage fleet and working boats are well versed in working with the rowers/paddlers. Much less so those in the leisure power craft</p> <p>8. No master plan for the area. Developments have increased the ambient noise. This development should not allow that.</p> <p>9. Glebe Island Bridge is in shocking repair. Some superyachts struggle to get through. More superyachts means it is less likely to achieve an equitable outcome for opening/closing arrangements for the restored bridge.</p> <p>10. Consolidation is a cynical ploy to make future expansion easier</p> <p>11. Double the number of berths will have a disastrous effect on Rozelle Bay. They dominate the bay, stick out into the channel, reversing is clumsy, and when waiting to berth or go through the bridge they disrupt all other activity</p>	<p>1. Application lodged in accordance with the legislative regime</p> <p>2. Only issue was the outdoor seating. Application is seeking consent as required by that condition</p> <p>3. In accordance with the legislation. Submissions received up to four months after exhibition</p> <p>4. The documents are all online</p> <p>5. 2.6.1. 3D models not required, but see Figure 1 in 2.6.1. This is a modification application, such a forum was not considered necessary given the relatively minor anticipated impacts</p> <p>6. 2.5</p> <p>7. No evidence provided that the boats from the superyacht marina are causing problems for rowers/paddlers. 2.4.2</p> <p>8. The land is subject to the Rozelle and Blackwattle Bays Master Plan.</p> <p>9. 2.7.2 and 3.3.6</p> <p>10. If future expansion was proposed, it would be subject to environmental assessment, wherein impacts eg on the water traffic would be reviewed.</p>

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<p>on the bay. The boats themselves are not unduly noisy, but their crews sometimes are and always their foghorns.</p> <p>12. Massive increase in floor space, terrace areas, bulk and height of car park will destroy the visual appeal. This is a hotel in a maritime working area</p> <p>13. Increase in size and capacity of parking area admits understatement of parking provisions previously</p> <p>14. Outdoor seating, terraces and removal of airlocks were dealt with in the original approval</p> <p>15. Entertainment noise means the application should have been sent to an extremely wide variety of people. History of noise from White Bay Hotel, barges on Rozelle Bay and Liquidity</p> <p>16. Should scrap the original approval and start again</p>	<p>11. 2.2.4, 2.4. The boats moor within the limit of moorings area which forms part of the leasing arrangements with the RMS. This area will not alter.</p> <p>12. 1.3, 2.1.1, 2.6. There is no hotel approved or requested on the site.</p> <p>13. 2.3.1</p> <p>14. Outdoor seating was conditioned. Airlocks no longer forms part of the application 2.2.1, 2.2.5</p> <p>15. The application was notified by the Department to the area shown in 3.1.1.4. It is the Department's responsibility to notify</p> <p>16. This will not happen. Works have commenced under the 2012 approval</p>
11	J Morgan Alexandra Rd Glebe	<p>1. Adverse effect on residents. It is an entertainment complex on public land zoned for maritime use</p> <p>2. Creation of the marina is by stealth from temporary Olympics to the largest superyacht facility in the southern hemisphere</p> <p>3. Inadequate community consultation – references notification from the original proposal</p> <p>4. Noise testing for original development was inadequate as conducted during the day. Should do more noise testing at night.</p> <p>5. Liquidity had noise restrictions</p> <p>6. Impact on Glebe Island Bridge. NSW Superyacht Industry Association has argued the bridge should be demolished</p> <p>7. Public benefit should be paramount (SREP). Changes put commercial development ahead of users of Bicentennial Park</p> <p>8. Scale of boat storage facility impinges on visual amenity increases concerns for development of the foreshore area</p> <p>9. Urban Growth</p>	<p>1. 2.1.1, 2.1.47, 2.1.7</p> <p>2. 2.1.5</p> <p>3. 2.8.1, 3.1</p> <p>4. 2.2</p> <p>5. 2.2.3</p> <p>6. 2.7.2, 3.3.6</p> <p>7. 2.1.7, 2.1.8</p> <p>8. Not part of this modification</p> <p>9. 2.7.1, 3.2</p> <p>10. 2.1.6</p>

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		10. Rozelle Bay should not be a playground for the superrich to the detriment of the public	
12	M Burgess 501 Glebe Point Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refocusing the space from mostly marine to an entertainment zone 2. On public land and commercial concerns shouldn't allow them to improve their position at the cost of the community 3. Seeking alterations to an agreed position with the community by removing controls and expanding the entertainment facility size 4. Expanding the facility will impact on small craft, kayaks, dragon boats, rowers and catamarans 5. Constraints on outdoor dining areas were worked out in consultation with the community but this is seeking to dump that. They also wish to remove all agreed constraints on events and noise 6. Creating maximum commercial return at the expense of the community. Public good is not being served 7. A full review by independent consultants is required for transparency and to protect the valuable foreshore precinct from unrestrained development 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1 2. 2.1.7, 2.1.8 3. 2.1.1, 2.2.1, 2.2.2 4. 2.4.1, 2.4.2 5. Outdoor seating was conditioned. No change re events. 2.2.1 6. 2.1.8 7. This is a modification. The claim presupposes that consultants do not tell the truth
13	P & J Chandler 501 Glebe Point Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More noise. Approval originally did not address the exceedance over accepted limitations 2. This is the only specialised marina of its kind in NSW which need to be modernised to meet contemporary standards 3. Using stealth 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2 2. That is why the original application was made 3. It has been advertised, put on the website, submissions made. It is public.
14	confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 80% expansion of originally approved plan for the size of the marina and its noise controls. The plan was finalised after extensive public consultation and scrutiny. This is essentially a new application and requires the same scrutiny 2. Developer creep, violates SREP Sydney Harbour 3. Serious environmental threat to the Blackwattle Bay parkland, the foreshore regeneration area opposite and the local community 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.4.1, 2.2.1, 2.2.2. Considerable scrutiny has been involved. The modifications are not so extensive that it comprises a new application 2. 2.1.9 3. 2.2.3. 2.5. Blackwattle Bay parkland is a long way away
15	A Larkum Alexandra Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entertainment areas on the land base. Looks like original consent – noise from music and Liquidity. Music must be contained indoors 2. Increase in number of boats. If one looks at the space the marina is taking up today, and almost double this, there does not seem nearly enough room for 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1. 2.2.1. Mod does not change the trial period condition for outdoor bands 2. 2.4.1, 2.5.

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		that increase in boats. Sediment disturbance. Consideration should be given to removing them	
16	J Nguyen Unit in Glebe	1. Increase in size and scope will impact on the quality of life and leisure and safety. Preserve working harbour not an entertainment precinct for the rich and famous	1. 2.4.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.6
17	Confidential Eglington Rd Glebe Point	1. Increased noise impact by outdoor hospitality, more traffic, removal of airlocks and other noise management measures 2. The yacht club is setting new and unapproved objectives in maritime zone <i>[difficult to discern the argument]</i> 3. Increased berths will put pressure on congested waterfront 4. Request is outside Government's requirements for a masterplan for the Bays precinct. Expansion should be reviewed after any masterplan is complete. 5. Glebe Island Bridge. Expansion not compatible with retention of the bridge and should determine its future first.	1. 2.2.1, 2.3.2 2. Not relevant to this application 3. 2.4.2 4. 2.7.1, 3.2 5. 2.7.2, 3.3.6
18	Confidential Glebe Point	1. Significant implications for the future for the Bays area and Glebe Island Bridge 2. Significant increase in outdoor entertainment, a departure from public objectives for maritime use 3. Pre-empting Bays Precinct Urban Renewal Plan. Expansion should be in context of that plan 4. Bay is small and congested 5. Marina was originally temporary. This is more than a simple modification nearly doubling capacity and removing constraints placed by earlier approvals. 6. Justification under GFC not sound.	1. 2.7.2, 2.7, 3.2, 3.3.6 2. 2.1.1, 2.1.4 3. 2.7.1, 3.2 4. 2.4.2 5. 2.1.5, 2.1.1 6. 2.9
19	Confidential	1. A hotel, function centre, restaurants and cafes indicates intent beyond a maritime use 2. Removal of noise constraints imposed by PAC with increased seating capacity removes or reduces the possibility for noise management if changes go ahead. Give neighbours the opportunity to negotiate if there are noise problems. 3. Protect the bay for the future for a vibrant, working and enjoyable place.	1. 2.1.1, 2. 2.2.1 3. 2.1.4

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
20	M Manton 501 Glebe Point Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object that public land has been given to a private group to develop a huge business complex masquerading as a superyacht club. It is installing a shopping centre, including a gigantic pub 2. It will steal water space from the more diverse and deserving users, such as the heritage fleet and passive watercraft. 3. Yachts have large on board entertainment areas so they don't need a club 4. Sound travels over water from the yachts and the boat repair works 5. Foreshore walk is popular and should continue around entire bay with genuine marine related work and activities and green spaces 6. Housing development will expect a setback from the water 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.7. The modification seeks no retail space. No hotel approved or requested 2. 2.4.1 3. No change to the area of the club is proposed 4. 2.2. No boat repairs are envisaged other than minor maintenance consistent with a marina 5. Noted. 2.1.10 6. Not relevant
21	E Elenius Convenor Pymont Action Inc	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outdoor areas enlarged including on rooftop and amplified music can be played up to 10pm which is unacceptable. There should be no amplified music. 2. Use of the walkway will be frequently interrupted and controlled by the marina operators at their discretion 3. Oppose increase in height on visual impact grounds. 4. Confusion as believes there will be additional 18 car spaces in the car park building and additional 70 elsewhere on site 5. Increased vessels increases churn of polluted seabed, hazardous wash for rowers and dragon boaters, generate additional pollution, noise and disruption of foreshore parks 6. Increased water traffic re-empts future use of Glebe Island Bridge 7. Piecemeal development of the Bays Precinct and MOD should be put on hold 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Music not part of the modification 2. The approval is for 24 hour public access with no rights to interrupt or control public use. This is not requested to change. 2.1.10 3. 2.6 4. Additional spaces are proposed in car park building 5. 2.5, 2.4.2, 2.2.3 6. 2.7.2, 3.3.6 7. 2.7.1, 3.2
22	D Watson Wigram Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Governments have mislead – it was temporary and it is not on a 99 year lease 2. Negative noise impact on residents and users of the parklands and impact on the visual amenity 3. It is part of the Bays Precinct and should be treated as a component of a single plan 4. Modifications show that a goal is to create an entertainment /shopping/ dining precinct, another Darling Harbour whereas it is zoned for maritime use 5. Increased berths risks interfering with waterway use by rowers and dragon boaters. Sediments will be stirred up and spread. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorrect. It is not on a 99 year lease. 2.1.5 2. 2.2.4, 2.2.2 3. 2.7.1, 3.2 4. 2.1.1, 2.1.2 5. 2.4.2, 2.5 6. 2.1.10 7. Probably means Glebe Island Bridge. 2.7.2, 3.3.6

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		6. Restriction of community access to the foreshore, with a possibility of limiting a foreshore walkway from the City to Balmain 7. Pyrmont Bridge. Will inhibit possible future functional use of the bridge	
23	Confidential – a planner	1. Departmental consideration was wrong to conclude that there would be little social impact from the original application as it impacts on large numbers of Glebe Point residents and visitors to the foreshore areas. 2. Proximity to Glebe Point 3. Noise transfers across the water 4. Approved hours extend into the night every day of the week, with no relief for the residents. Operational conditions do not work and are weak and can be changed or flouted at will. 5. Increase in parking spaces by nearly 50% and additional car park level cannot be justified for traffic impact, safety and visual amenity 6. The proposed building is no more than an entertainment complex. Redesign reinforces its use as a predominantly entertainment facility 7. Consider it in the light of Bays Precinct plans 8. It is an overdevelopment with intolerable impacts on the community of Glebe Point	1. Criticism relates to a previous application, 2.2.3 2. 2.2 3. 2.2 4. 2.2.1. If they are flouted they risk being shut down in the same manner as every other operation in NSW. Mod does not include any change to approved hours of operation 5. 2.3.1 6. 2.1.1, 2.1.2. The redesign does not include any additional “entertainment facilities”. The outdoor decks are already approved 7. 2.7.1, 3.2 8. 2.2.2, 2.2.4
24	Confidential	1. The open air seating will see this harbour space alienated and transformed into a Darling Harbour type facility	1. 2.1.2
25	H Middleton Stewart St Glebe	1. Delay decisions until in context with Bays Precinct Plan 2. Public good and protection of natural assets under SREP Sydney Harbour should take precedence over private and commercial interests. The changes area a flagrant disregard for this 3. Originally a temporary measure. It has never been legitimised as a permanent fixture, making expansion less acceptable 4. Restaurants, live bands, outdoor seating and outdoor licensed venues operate 7 days a week with noise impacts on residents and parkland users. Liquidity was bad. Expansion will cause a vastly greater noise impact 5. Public land should be retained for public use and benefit. Zoned maritime but	1. 2.7.1, 3.2 2. 2.1.8 3. 2.1.5 4. 2.2.2. No change proposed to GFA of restaurants or to live band condition 5. 2.1.7, 2.1.1, 2.1.6 6. 2.5 7. 2.4.1 8. 2.2.3, 2.1.1 9. 2.2

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<p>modifications create an entertainment area and playground for the super rich. Not lawful, moral or just</p> <p>6. Bay is polluted and there will be inevitable disturbance of polluted sediments with consequences</p> <p>7. The proposal will take over more of the passive water in a small heavily used bay with negative effects on traditional bay users.</p> <p>8. Enjoyment of the parks will be disturbed by noise form the increase in superyachts and the entertainment precinct</p> <p>9. Extra outdoor seating, more berths, restaurants, live venues car parking and reduced noise controls will have major implications for local amenities</p>	
26	Confidential	<p>1. Thorough public consultation is required. Can't trust the process.</p> <p>2. Must have affordable housing and sustainable transport (so don't demolish the Glebe Island Bridge)</p> <p>3. Must include true access to the foreshore by the community not just the rich and famous ie it must not be an entertainment precinct</p> <p>4. Noise travelling over water. Airlocks should not be removed and there needs to be specific consents for events and noise</p> <p>5. Any measuring of the current ambient noise should be done at night not on a Saturday afternoon</p>	<p>1. 3.1.1, 2.8.1</p> <p>2. Housing is not a permissible use in the zone. 2.7.2, 3.3.6</p> <p>3. 2.1.10, 2.1.1, 2.1.6</p> <p>4. 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>5. 2.2.1, 2.2.2 Appendix C</p>
27	D Walsh Northcote Rd Sydney	<p>1. Enormous impact on the physical environment in Rozelle Bay, is extremely out of character with the remainder of the Bay and a misuse of land deemed for maritime use not an entertainment precinct</p> <p>2. Noise travels across the bay and no mechanisms to prevent and police excessive noise seems to be in place</p>	<p>1. 2.5, 2.1.1</p> <p>2. 2.2</p>
28	V Walsh Northcote Rd Sydney	<p>1. Object on basis of size and noise</p>	<p>1. 2.2, 2.6</p>
29	Confidential	<p>1. Pre-empts strategic plans for Bays Precinct</p> <p>2. Impact will be felt by hundreds as only 200m across the water and noise travels</p> <p>3. Proponents are not "good neighbours" and history of Liquidity</p> <p>4. Proponents are insensitive to public foreshore access. An increase in the size</p>	<p>1. 2.7.1, 3.2</p> <p>2. 2.2.3</p> <p>3. 2.2.3. Liquidity was not operated by the Proponents during the time when noise was an issue</p>

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<p>of the marina will lead to more boat movements and a maritime push-back against the stated aim of re-using the heritage listed Glebe Island Bridge</p> <p>5. Little justification for increase in height and car park with no increase in public benefit or amenity</p> <p>6. Photo montages are grossly misleading</p>	<p>4. 2.1.10, 2.4.1, 2.7.2, 3.3.6</p> <p>5. 2.6, 2.3.1</p> <p>6. 2.6.1</p>
30	M Lawrence 501 Glebe Point Road Glebe	<p>1. Carefully judged compromise on noise from approval has shifted balance away from the local community</p> <p>2. Increased outdoor and indoor area will increase noise, particularly from the level 2 premises and upper level of the car park</p> <p>3. Use of level 2 area as marine use is vague</p> <p>4. Considers that there should be a series of separate requests for outdoor seating subject to a trial period. The outdoor seating request is for a repeal of a current condition</p> <p>5. The original conditions were a fine balance but the modification is a move in the direction of increased noise</p> <p>6. Comments on MOD 2 re the air locks</p> <p>7. The extra level on the east building is likely to be the largest contributor to extra noise, especially from the deck. Expansion of the car park to another level will have a similar effect</p> <p>8. Blanket approval of outdoor seating will increase noise level</p> <p>9. Recommends –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ delete level 2 with balcony, but if approved do not approved outdoor seating on the deck ○ Permissions for outdoor seating should be limited in area with a trial period 	<p>1. 2.2.1</p> <p>2. 2.2.2 and Appendix C</p> <p>3. 2.1.1</p> <p>4. The condition does not specifically require a series of applications. It requires further consent. 2.2.5</p> <p>5. 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>6. 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>7. 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>8. 2.2.1, 2.2.2</p> <p>9. The applicant notes the recommendations but also indicates that the level 2 deck will only be used for commercial maritime tenants. Noise controls will remain in place and no trial period will be required</p>
31	S Superina Northcote Road Glebe	<p>1. Objects to extension of scope of development and extension of hours of operation</p> <p>2. Noise beyond 10pm each evening is not acceptable</p> <p>3. Unacceptable that private interests take precedence over rights of residents. Not reasonable in a residential area</p> <p>4. If approved should have that noise should be no greater than that currently experienced</p>	<p>1. No extension of hours.</p> <p>2. The mod does not request any use after 10pm other than the 24 hour operation of commercial maritime offices in Level 2</p> <p>3. 2.1.8</p> <p>4. 2.2.2</p>

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
32	Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was temporary and never intended to be permanent 2. Live music venues is unacceptable 3. The site is dangerous for vehicle and pedestrian access 4. Current marina size is adequate, more would overwhelm 5. A previous application for a ferry service was defeated because of concerns about impacts on rowers etc and expansion would cause problems for rowers. 6. Increased noise by converting to an entertainment venue 7. Impacts of extra berthing should be fully investigated by qualified scientists and discussed with the community 8. Community should be more involved 9. Local transport should be reviewed as the buses are usually overcrowded. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.5 2. No change proposed to amplified music 3. 2.3 4. 2.4.1 5. Noted. Not part of this application 6. 2.1.1 7. 2.5, 3.1.1 8. 3.1.1, 2.8 9. 2.3.2
33	G Kang Eglington Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed changes would turn it into an entertainment venue with acoustic impact unacceptable 2. Noise carries across water to Glebe and Balmain 3. Proposal for restaurants, outdoor seating area and licensed venues would mean louder noise and changes the purpose and nature of the approved development. 4. The land is publicly owned and intended for maritime purposes and should not be an entertainment quarter. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1 2. 2.2 3. 2.2 4. 2.1.1, 2.1.2
34	V Kang Eglington Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It was temporary and has been allowed to grow out of proportion. Expansion to include restaurants and entertainment venues compounds this. The increase in noise is unacceptable near residential areas 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.5, 2.1.1, 2.2
35	Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposals do not comply with provisions of s75W. Expert advice received by local residents indicate that the Department is not legally able to approve the modification. Details to be provided by the objection by Jock Palmer and Associates [that accompanies the Save our Bays submission] 2. WHO health effects from noise and WHO noise limits 3. Appears that they believe that the proposal includes the removal of noise testing and placing loud speakers facing over the water to Glebe 4. All should be rejected 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.10, 3.3.1 2. Not part of NSW industrial noise policy 3. Incorrect assumptions made 4. Comment is noted
36	D Doherty –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. decisions on modifications inappropriate at this time – should be delayed to 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.7.1

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
	planner Stewart St Glebe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> coordinate with Bays Precinct 2. SREP Sydney Harbour – public good takes precedence over private and commercial interests 3. Originally was temporary – and has never been legitimised as a permanent fixture making expansion less acceptable 4. Proposed restaurants, outdoor seating and outdoor licensed venues with live bands will operated all day 7 days a week with unacceptable noise 5. Public land should be retained for public benefit. Will create an entertainment area and a playground for the super rich. This is not lawful, moral or just 6. Disturbance of polluted sediments 7. Passive water areas already restricted. Proposal will take over more of the water in the small and heavily used bay with major negative impact 8. Enjoyment of parklands will be disturbed by noise from increase in superyachts and entertainment precinct 9. Will have major impacts on local amenities, including by reduced noise controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. 2.1.8 3. 2.1.5 4. Bands not included in Mod. 2.2 5. 2.1.7, 2.1.6 6. 2.5 7. 2.4.1 8. 2.2.4 9. 2.2.1
37	J Newton Alexandra Rd Glebe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gas guzzling environmental disasters were temporary 2. Is taking over the entire north side of the bay 3. Noise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.5 2. 2.4.1 3. 2.2
38	D Mason & J Neary, 501 Glebe Point Rd Glebe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Massive expansion and intensification 2. The consolidation of approvals will have deleterious effects on the public domain, the environment and residents 3. No regard had to neighbouring precinct plans 4. Private interests ignoring public 5. Are members of the SuperYacht Club but were not consulted 6. Noise – no consideration of mix of outdoor seating, alcohol and poor public transport 7. Effect on water craft of increase in tenders is not assessed 8. Live music and venues create noise problems. 9. Amplification of music and announcements detract from amenity 10. Noise mitigation measures are inadequate and should be subject to review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.4.1, 2.6, 2.2.1 2. Not specified how this will happen, 2.10 3. 3.2 See also sections 3.5.2, 3.6.2, 3.6.3 in the EA for MOD1. 4. 2.1.8 5. 3.1.1 6. 2.2 7. 2.4.2, and section 4.1 in EA MOD1 8. Not part of application 9. Not part of application 10. 2.2.1

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		and a complaints mechanism 11. Glebe Island Bridge should be trialled as a thoroughfare and will ease congestion 12. Not in the public interest to have car parking and entertainment. The proposal consolidates the alienation of the Bay from the public. SREP public good over private interests	11. 2.8.2, 3.3.6 12. 2.3.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.10, 2.1.8
39	K Walker	1. Development is unhealthy 2. Should be an urban forest permaculture garden showcasing sustainability techniques	1. 2.5 2. Not permissible in the zone
40	G Gamble Annandale	1. Badly polluted Bay 2. Little water left open for others 3. Visual impact of boat store will be made worse 4. Intrusive noise and light impacts to residents 5. Car park is alienating publicly owned land 6. Public access is fenced off 7. Increase of traffic flow and congestion at the intersection 8. Land and sea components should be kept separate so that each is required to make applications for any changes 9. Was temporary and subject to many modification applications over the years. A planning mess 10. Attaches "A short geological and environmental history of the Sydney estuary, Australia" by Gavin Birch (source unknown) and "Is the ecology of Sydney Harbour threatened by the disturbance of contaminated sediments?: an experimental assessment of the effects of resuspension of contaminated sediment on sessile animals of Sydney Harbour" by N Knott and E Johnston	1. 2.5 2. 2.4.1 3. 2.6 4. 2.2. Lighting is indicated in Landscape plan. Lighting is subject to condition D23 5. 2.1.7 6. Incorrect 2.1.10 7. 2.3.2 8. 2.10, 3.3.1 9. 2.1.5 10. 2.5
41	Save Rozelle Bay Association (J Cave)	1. Visual impact of car park building 2. SREP (SH) – public land 3. Increased traffic 4. Entertainment area and restricted foreshore access after hours 5. Out of centre location will detrimentally impact other local commercial centres 6. Views	1. 2.6 2. 2.1.7 3. 2.3.2 4. 2.1.1.2.1.10. Access remains 24 hours 5. This is unlikely 6. 2.6.2 7. 2.6.3

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		7. Architectural form inconsistent with DCP 8. No consideration of way promenade will be used or urban design elements 9. Noise 10. Alcohol related social impacts 11. Entertainment precinct not working harbour 12. Impact on passive watercraft	8. Landscape plan. 2.1.10, 3.1.1.4 9. 2.2 10. Will be the subject of assessment when Liquor licence applications are made 11. 2.1.1 12. 2.4.2
42	P Thorogood Oxley Street Glebe	1. Inadequate community consultation, Received no notification 2. Noise – Benbows testing indicate noise is about 50DB. Additional outdoor seating would worsen it 3. Air locks should be retained 4. What use is “commercial maritime uses”? 5. Noisy activities outside for extended times is unacceptable 6. Adversely affects the quiet enjoyment of residents and park users	1. 2.8.1, 3.1.1 2. 2.2 3. 2.2.1 No longer relevant 4. 2.1.1. Defined by consent 5. 2.2 6. 2.2.4
43	C Hendy Dragon Boats Abreast	1. Reduction in space in the bays caused by the development and increased boat movements pose a safety risk 2. Sydney Harbour is a public resource (SREP (SH))	1. 2.4.1 2. 2.1.8
44	J Harvey Annandale	1. A paddler. It is very scary when the boats move around at way over 4 knots, particularly they do early mornings and after dark in winter. Space is small	1. 2.4.2
45	G Dwyer Hereford St Glebe	1. Entertainment precinct 2. supports marine facilities but this is for restaurants, licensed venues inconsistent with marine use 3. land is publicly owned 4. alienates harbour foreshore 5. Detrimental to amenity of Glebe Point and park users	1. 2.1.1 2. 2.1.1 3. 2.1.7 4. 2.1.10 5. 2.2.4
46	C Moran, past President Dragon Boats NSW	1. Will endanger or exclude members of the public from passive recreation 2. Was promised to be a temporary marina	1. 2.4 2. 2.1.5
47	S Dodd-Gilhooly Lilyfield	1. Dragon boat paddlers. Extension of marina with maxi yachts is excessive 2. Potential issues with noise and parking	1. 2.4.1 2. 2.2, 2.3
48	R Hyer	1. Dragon boat participant, will greatly increase risk of on water accidents or near misses 2. Area zoned for maritime use not entertainment precinct	1. 2.4, 2. 2.1.1 3. 2.7.2, 3.3.6

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Implications for Glebe Island Bridge, Rozelle Bay and master plan Repealing noise controls from the PAC which will impact the increased population in the area 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1
49	B Jarry, 501 Glebe Point Rd Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noise Want to enjoy a “semi-industrial harbour” not an entertainment area 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2 2.1.1
50	S Proud	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dragon boat paddler relies on the Bays. Will have a major impact on training, preparations and facilities for dragon boaters due to large boat traffic and a reduction in facilities available How will the development benefit developing International, national and regional sport of dragon boating and outriggering? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.4 This is not the aim of the development
51	J Stone 501 Glebe Point Rd Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Appreciate Blackwattle and Rozelle Bays are working bays. There is already noise from superyachts hooting as the manoeuvre and ANZAC Bridge There are occasional “boom boom” ferries with loud thumping music which have decreased in recent years, but the outdoor entertainment components may establish such a “boom boom” ferry which won’t move on, every night Should be a ban on amplification of music in outdoor areas 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2 Ferries not part of the modification. There is no public wharf to enable such ferries to berth. Realistically such ferries want to retain their customers on their own boat Not part of the modification
52	S Middleton Darlinghurst	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dragon boater - appears will reduce public access and enjoyment of our only safe bay. An increase in small boat/watercraft facilities is welcome Need to share the Bay and not right to have larger craft wanting to increase and take over more space 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.10, 2.4.1 Noted 2.4.1, 2.4.2
53	S Tattersall	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> From Sydney Uni Women’s Rowing Club Private use of public land Doubts that private dwellings are included in the zoning Was temporary and construction of dry boat storage will encroach on the water area for passive recreation to advantage the super rich and make it unsafe 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> noted 2.1.8, 2.1.7 None are proposed 2.1.5. Clear confusion with the development. 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.1.6
54	M Cantwell COO Dragon Boats NSW	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Water safety. The Bays provide one of the very few safe areas Increasing the size of the marina would have a major impact on the dragon boats and limit use of the available waterway and influence the ability to 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.4.2 2.4.1 2.9

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> grow the sport 3. GFC is not a justification 4. Fewer constraints on future modifications 5. Should be in context of Bays, not an entertainment precinct, major implications etc 6. SREP (Sydney Harbour) use of public land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. 2.10, 3.3.1 5. 2.7.1, 3.2, 2.1.1 6. 2.1.8
55	R Porges 501 Glebe Point Road Glebe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise constraints of PAC being removed 2. Yacht club is masquerading as a marina 3. Not in the interests of the local and visiting community 4. A small clubroom with a small outdoor deck facing north may be acceptable 5. Should be no outdoor decks on the southern eastern or western aspects, walls should be soundproofed and glass areas triple glazed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.1 2. Yacht club is essentially unchanged 3. More marine uses are proposed 4. and 5. Consent is already provided for decks on the south side and two commercial buildings. A glasshouse is not approved.
56	D Parnell Pyrmont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A paddler 2. Noise 3. Valued for health and fitness but increased boats now moored encroach on space for other users 4. Boat movements are making passive boating less safe, are a permanent physical obstruction and many are pumping raw sewage into the bay 5. Consideration and consultation with members of passive boating clubs is paramount 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. 2.2 3. 2.4.1 4. 2.4.2 5. Noted 3.1.1.1
57	N Peel Travel Managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Few constraints on further modifications, see in context of the Bays, entertainment precinct, repeal noise controls of PAC 2. Noise 3. Bay is small 4. SREP (Sydney Harbour) public land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.10, 2.7.1, 3.2, 2.1.1, 2.2.1 2. 2.2 3. 2.4.2, 2.4.1 4. 2.1.8, 2.1.7
58	R White Balmain East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pleasing aspect from the Annandale shoreline will be spoiled by large buildings 2. Blackwattle Bay is already busy and will be overcrowded if the marinas are built and used. There is already one adjacent 3. Noise and discomfort to park users 4. Nuisance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.6 2. Wrong Bay. 2.4.1. Apparent confusion 3. 2.2.3 4. unspecified

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
59	C Summerfield	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dragon boat user, K1 paddler and outrigger 2. Increased water activity may represent a heightened risk to other public users of the environment 3. If larger vessels take over the area it will push us out into the harbour further, increasing risk 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. 2.4.2 3. 2.4.1
60	C Mason	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intensification of use generally 2. No regard to neighbouring plans 3. Public land for private use 4. Noise, visual amenity Glebe Island Bridge 5. No amplification or announcements should be made outside – opening balconies would allow more transmission of noise 6. Glebe Island Bridge future use 7. Aquatic ecology 8. Contrary to public interest 9. SREP (Sydney Harbour) public land 10. Saw the photo on the Save our Bays flyer illustrating a lookalike building devastating the existing trees and bird habitat. There will be a twin constructed over vegetation and should plant 5 trees for every tree removed 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.1 2. 3.2 See also sections 3.5.2, 3.6.2, 3.6.3 in the EA for MOD1 3. 2.1.8 4. 2.2, 2.6, 2.7.2, 3.3.6 5. None proposed, 2.2 6. 2.7.2, 3.3.6 7. 2.5 8. 2.1.8 9. 2.1.7, 2.1.8 10. Incorrect development, 2.6.1, 2.6.2. See landscape plan
61	T Evans Balmain	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Member of paddling community 2. Massively and negatively impact the whole paddling community for the sake of a few rich people that treat the bay as a parking lot 3. It turns the bay into an entertainment precinct 4. Environmental impacts, public land 5. Community consultation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. 2.4, 2.1.6 3. 2.1.1 4. 2.5, 2.1.7 5. 2.8, 3.1
62	R Curran	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water congestion diminishing the usable area for clubs takes away public use areas. Bay already at capacity. 2. Public use over private 3. A regular user of the Bay 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.4.2, 2.4.1 2. 2.1.8 3. noted
63	J Rihari-Thomas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protection of the waterway for rowers, kayakers and dragon boats training 2. See in context of Bays Precinct and don't pre-empt the master plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.4.2 2. 2.7.2
64	B Porges 501 Glebe Point Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Same as submission No. 55 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See above

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
	Glebe		
65	Susan Cleary Glebe Point Residents Group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to outdoor seating, additional roof level eastern building and removal of air locks 2. In contravention of master plan 3. Negatively impacts on community for noise and hours of operation 4. Negative water and traffic implications 5. Proponents seeking to revisit matter which were not achieved the previous time 6. Incremental creep 7. Use of additional roof level and terrace 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2 2. Yes re height only 3. 2.2. Hours of operation not changing save reduced ancillary use hours on outdoor seating 4. 2.4, 2.3 5. A11 requires a new application. Air locks no longer requested 6. 2.1.9 7. This is for the very use for which the area is zoned
66	A Davies Dragon Boater	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dragon boater, SREP (Sydney Harbour) protects the harbour for public use 2. Water congestion 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.8 2. 2.4.2
67	G O'Malley Rower	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entertainment precinct. Anticipate party boats remaining in the precinct 2. Increase in boats will reduce safety in the water 3. Dry boat storage is ugly and increase of this (up to triple) will only further harm the heritage and appearance of the area 4. Traffic congestion 5. Development should be balanced 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1. No reason why party boats would remain in the area due to the modifications 2. 2.4.2 3. Wrong application 4. 2.3.2 5. Noted
68	W Irik Head coach Sydney Tsunami Dragon Boat Club	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should actively preserve Rozelle Bay which has been cleaned up. 2. Bay will be adversely affected by increase in yacht berths and tenders. There isn't room for more boats, more noise and entertainment areas. Must protect our foreshores 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.5. Application will not harm 2. 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.2
69	P Cerneaz dragon boater	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please ensure the harbour remains available for dragon boating with at least equal or greater access 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.4.1, 2.4.2
70	A Reeves Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of integration with Bays Precinct 2. Inadequate consideration of traffic and access implications 3. Adverse impacts on residential areas of Rozelle Bay and on existing and proposed open space and vegetation, and on environment, character, amenity of the area from noise, light and pollution 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.7.1 2. 2.3 3. 2.2, 2.5 4. 2.5 5. Considered in the original application

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse impact on the marine environment Not taking long term sustainability and wider community benefit into account 	
71	D Buckingham Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 99 year lease is excessive Bulk and scale is beyond all comprehension Entertainment not maritime facility Increased parking indicates catering for large crowds to a pub Noise Doubling the boats will interfere with passive use of the bays and training efforts of the dragon boats and rowing clubs Will stir up the toxic sediments A detrimental impact on the restorative value of the park and adjacent walkway 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Inaccurate and irrelevant - no 99 year lease. 2.6. Suspect submitter is considering the incorrect development 2.1.1 2.3.1. No pub is included 2.2 2.4.2 2.5 2.2.4, 2.1.10
72	J Reynolds	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noise impacts on people seeking quiet enjoyment Bay faces major increases in water use with redevelopment of Fish Markets Construction of West connex will increase pressure on ANZAC Bridge requiring a new bridge or reuse of old bridge 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2 Likely increase from Fishmarkets will be in Blackwattle Bay. Beyond scope of MOD Beyond scope of MOD
73	D Gibson Blackwattle Bay	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Shocked at the destruction of the opposing shore by the Sydney Superyacht Marina especially at night. It has destroyed any ambience we had left in the area. To extend by the amount indicated is out of control 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Likely confusion with Sydney Boathouse as SSM ground level piles are not very visible
74	M Hgibar and D Orr Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about future negative impact after the first building has been erected, increasing visual pollution Noise Water and land traffic congestion Other alternatives should be considered from the publically owned waterfront land 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Confusion with Sydney Boathouse. 2.6 2.2 2.4.2, 2.3.2 This is a modification application
75	G Havens, Avon St Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Not compatible with public access to the foreshore Inadequate controls against noise pollution. 10.00pm is too late Area not well served by public transport so should not be encouraged for entertainment venues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.10 2.2.1 2.3
76	C Alcorso Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Entertainment venue with light, noise, waste, traffic will increase greatly No facilities for low income users of the harbour eg small boat rentals, 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1, 2.2, 2.3, landscape plan. Lighting subject to condition D23

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		kayakers, rowers, walkers, picnickers or sailing schools 3. Taking over public space for private profit-making purposes 4. People should be able to walk around the harbour	2. 2.1.11 3. 2.1.7 4. 2.1.10
77	A Playford Glebe Point Road Glebe	1. Impact from noise from Liquidity and insufficient noise controls	1. 2.2.3, 2.2.1
78	W Fehrs	1. A great initiative overall	1. Noted
79	B Watson Annandale	1. Bays used for training and representative squads 2. Lack of public consultation 3. Zoned maritime not entertainment 4. Should encourage active lifestyles	1. Noted 2. 2.8.1 3. 2.1.1 4. Noted
80	M Cody	1. Was supposed to be temporary 2. Impedes access to foreshore, rowing teams on Blackwattle Bay, is an eyesore 3. It is public land, will alienate the foreshore and is for rich boys toys	1. 2.1.5 2. 2.1.10, 2.4.2. Appears confused with Sydney Boathouse 3. 2.1.7, 2.1.6
81	R Thompson	1. Over development of public land 2. Reduction in access for the public 3. Noise and high level activity will severely impact park users, foreshore walkers, rowers and others	1. 2.1.7. Remains under the site coverage from the Master Plan 2. 2.1.10 3. 2.2.4, 2.4.2, 2.4.1
82	B Lane	1. Consider the residents and bay users. It is already difficult with Bay traffic	1. 2.4.2
83	R Bowrey 501 Glebe Point Road	1. Noise from Liquidity and noise constraints are to be removed 2. Area of Bay with the marina is narrow which impacts on safety for bay users creating potential congestion 3. Changes are unbalanced in favour of the developer and do not factor in community needs	1. 2.2.3, 2.2.1 2. 2.4.2, 2.4.1 3. 2.1.10. Outdoor seating encourages the public to also use the site
84	P Thomas 19 Stewart St	1. Will exacerbate previously identified problems particularly noise 2. Protect the public above the \$	1. 2.2 2. 2.1.8
85	A Burgess Local architect	1. Requested changes to noise levels – tests show it exceeds and will destroy the amenity for park users and residents 2. Visual appearance fails to respect nature of site, locality and neighbourhood, is oversized and ugly 3. It will spoils the aspect from Glebe and Annandale 4. Building need redesigning to respect topography of site, local architecture	1. 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.4 2. 2.6. Appears to be confused with Sydney Boathouse 3. 2.6 4. 2.6.3, 2.6.2

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		and site's aspect and not obscure the view	
86	E Raftos	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Must be able to continue dragon boating in the Bay 2. Objects to not being consulted 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2.4.1 2. 2.8.1, 3.1.1
87	A Aston	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preempts Urban Growth master plan 2. Implications for Glebe Island Bridge 3. Yacht club shaping up as an entertainment precinct 4. Increase in level and height will be large and imposing 5. Public space and access not improved 6. Water congestion and noise impacts from more boats 7. SREP (SH) public good v private good 8. Requests more public consultation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.7.1 2. 2.7.2, 3.3.6 3. 2.1.1 4. 2.6 5. 2.1.10 6. 2.4.2, 2.2 7. 2.1.8 8. 2.8, 3.1.1
88	C Maguire & F Vavasour	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Being developed as an entertainment precinct 2. Appreciate the tranquillity of the park and area and don't want negative impacts on area and water 3. Object to any increased noise 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1 2. 2.2.4 3. 2.2
89	A Tucker Queens Park	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was temporary 2. Including entertainment venues and restaurants with outdoor seating and live band music is deplorable 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.5 2. 2.1.1. 1.3
90	L Harrison Local landscape architect	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water body for rowers and paddlers has shrunk, particularly when marina was included, which will be compromised more by this developer creep 2. Should not be finalised before overall planning strategy for the bays 3. Public waterfront land not entertainment precinct 4. Views to the water from surrounding areas are being blocked by massive blocks of built forms 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.4.1, 2.1.9 2. 2.7.1 3. 2.1.1 4. 2.1.1, 2.1.7 5. 2.6
91	A Findlay Annandale	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not in keeping with the area and detract from an area City of Sydney says they will make more amenable 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not in City of Sydney LGA. 2.6
92	I Pickles Toxteth Rd Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developer creep 2. Increase is excessive unacceptable visual, noise, road traffic and water traffic impacts 3. Pre-empts Bays Precinct Masterplan 4. Traffic on James Craig Road and Westlink intersection 5. Traffic study does not account for service vehicles and taxis 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.9 2. 2.6, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4.2 3. 2.7.2 4. 2.3.2 5. 2.3 6. 2.2

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		6. Increase in entertainment activities exacerbates noise, wind will enhance the noise and unacceptably disturb dwellings (Liquidity) 7. No additional entertainment precinct activities	7. 1.3
93	T Tran	1. Mod will have fewer constraints on future mods 2. Pre-empts masterplan 3. Not an entertainment precinct 4. Repealing PAC noise controls 5. GFC not relevant issue 6. Bay capacity already stretched 7. Public land (SREP) (Sydney Harbour)	1. 2.10 2. 2.7.1 3. 2.1.1 4. 2.2.1 5. 2.9 6. 2.4.2 7. 2.1.8, 2.1.7
94	Anonymous Lives opposite	1. Noise. Should not have loud music or amplified sound 2. Zoned maritime not entertainment precinct with noise implications 3. Inadequate consultation	1. 2.2. Application does not include amplified sound 2. 2.1.1 3. 2.8.1
95	R Quigley Wigram Lane Glebe	1. Safety concerns for users and residents of Rozelle Bay 2. Loss of the heritage “look and feel” of the area 3. A rare safe area for rowers, paddlers and kayakers with no through traffic. Noticed a significant increase in the occasions in which the dragon boat rowers and scullers have had to avoid yachts coming in/out of the marina. The Mod is exacerbating the problem 4. Increase in noise pollution 5. Aesthetically objectionable and will ruin /eradicate the visual heritage of the area. The existing development has so altered the skyline that if extended no trees will be seen on the horizon 6. A bad design, visually polluting the area	1. 2.4.2 2. There are no heritage items in the immediate area. 2.6 3. 2.4.2 4. 2.2 5. 2.6. Clear confusion with Sydney Boathouse. 6. 2.6.3. Possible confusion with Sydney Boathouse
96	S Salvidge Forsyth St Glebe	1. Don’t allow a new marina as it will impact on the park users 2. Zoned maritime not entertainment precinct	1. 2.2.3 2. 2.1.1
97	L Simpson-Booker 501 Glebe Point Rd	1. Pre-empts Bays precinct strategic plan 2. Zoned maritime not entertainment precinct 3. Noise will affect residents, park users and water users 4. Not good neighbours – see Liquidity 5. Insensitive to public foreshore access	1. 2.7.1 2. 2.1.1 3. 2.2.4, 2.2.2 4. 2.2.3 5. 2.1.10

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		6. More boat movements 7. A maritime push-back against the stated aim of re-using Glebe Island Bridge 8. Little justification for increase in building and car park levels and no increase in public benefit 9. Photo montages are grossly misleading 10. Development should be deferred	6. 2.4.2 7. 2.7.2, 3.3.6 8. 2.6.3, 3.1.6 9. 2.6.1 10. 2.7.1
98	J Newberry	1. A mini-Darling Harbour 2. Suggests Aboriginal cultural centre, sculpture garden, parks, boat museum, cafes, mosaics on foreshore	1. 2.1.2 2. Some suggestions are not permissible. This seeks to modify an approved development
99	C Speedy Pyrmont	1. Fine if you can isolate music/ crowd noise to eliminate exterior noise 2. Will react strongly if noise created 3. Area is relatively quiet in the evening and its nice 4. What building features will contain the noise and what fines imposed if noise standards are broken?	1. 2.2 2. 2.2.1 3. Noted 4. 2.2.1. Fines subject to same controls as elsewhere in Sydney
100	V Vlaskine Glebe	1. Concerned about less noise control and increased noise due to live bands 2. Current Regular party boats are disruptive 3. Would affect hundreds (1000s) of people 4. Impose proper outdoor noise restrictions	1. 2.2.1. 2.2.2. Bands not included in Mod 2. Not part of the development 3. 2.2 4. 2.2.1
101	R Dixon Toxteth Rd Glebe	1. Extra height of car park 2. Relaxation of noise restrictions and containment 3. Expansion of space for outdoor entertainment 4. Add new entertainment facilities not presently existing rather than enhancing the approved boating facilities 5. Negative impact on amenity of residences and parklands 6. Outside the masterplan for bays precinct	1. 2.6 2. 2.2.1, 2.2.2 3. Noted but has been subject to assessment 4. 2.1.1 5. 2.2.4 6. Not sure if existing or proposed. Uses comply to existing, otherwise 2.7.1
102	D Ball John St Glebe	1. Entertainment facilities and the amount of noise and hours interrupting the peace and quiet	1. 2.1.1, 2.2
103	B Connolly Hereford St Glebe	1. Approve 2. Typical case of Nimbyism 3. Glebe foreshore is amply catered for in terms of public access, walkways and	1-9 Noted

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<p>parkland</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maritime industrial precinct opposite is a vital part of working Sydney Harbour Recreational boating is a hugely popular pastime with few facilities for small boat owners Industrial activity is remarkably non-intrusive, fascinating and very quiet. Noise is from Anzac Bridge traffic Never experiences undue noise from party boats or industrial activity Precinct should be developed to cater to a significant sector of the maritime leisure industry Objectors are conducting a self-interested scare campaign. Reduced diversity makes the Harbour a less interesting place 	
104a	J Cashmore	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Request for more time 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Granted by the Department
104b	J Cashmore 501 Glebe Point Rd Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Restates points made by M Lawrence, HWL Ebsworth and Jock Palmer from Save our Bays submission Implications for Glebe Island Bridge Pre-empting Bays Precinct The proponents are on the record in the media as “pushing’ for Glebe Island Bridge to go Lack of proper process and poor consultation Notice in sex ads, use of misleading images, non-independent chair of Community Liaison Committee Wrongly claim that the plans were discussed at the Community Liaison Group DG’s environmental assessment report instilled no trust as did not take into account noise from across the water eg Liquidity Seeking to overturn PAC imposed noise conditions and constraints CLG should comply with Guidelines for Establishing and Operating Community Consultative Committees for Mining Projects Public benefit over private gain and community information/involvements constitute the keystone for development of liveable and interesting cities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> See response to Submission 132 2.7.2, 3.3.6 2.7.1 No evidence provided 2.8.1 Notice referenced was for the original application in 2010. Location within the paper is done by the Inner Western Suburbs Courier. Note that the Salvation Army was on the same page. 2.6.1, 2.8.2 Ms Cashmore was not present at that meeting. They were presented. No comment 2.2.1 2.8.2 2.1.8
105	S Ehms Darghan St Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to marina and dryboat storage Increase in boats will see overcrowding of the foreshore and an increase in 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Only part is relevant to this Mod 2.4.2, 2.4.1

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		water traffic and pose a risk to water users 3. Removal of all existing noise constraints will lead to unacceptable increase in noise 4. Public area being used for entertainment precinct	3. 2.2.1 4. 2.1.1, 2.1.7
106	S Berry Bellevue St Glebe	1. More and larger boats being moored, greater intrusion into the Bay's smaller boat traffic by large moored boats 2. Increased road traffic where there is no public transport 3. Northern side of the Bay will be full of parked super yachts 4. Don't need a Darling Harbour entertainment area 5. Why is Glebe Island Bridge allowed to rot and not be repaired?	1. 2.4.1 2. 2.3 3. 2.4.1 4. 2.1.2 5. Beyond the scope of the application
107	B Stevenson Centennial Park	1. Major expansions and intensification of use 2. No regard to neighbouring plans for the Bays Precinct and White Bay Power Station and GI Bridge 3. Public interest should prevail over private 4. Cumulative destruction of visual amenity and vegetation from the foreshore 5. Noise assessment does not take into account the mix of outdoor seating alcohol and poor public transport 6. Unsubstantiated assertions rather than assessments 7. Effect on recreational boating users is not considered 8. Proposal for live music venues creates noise and amenity problems. Should be no amplification outside 9. Greater value in retaining use of the GI Bridge 10. Greater scale and intensified use adversely affects the marine habitat, contravening SREP (SH) clause 21 11. Includes montage of Sydney Boathouse. Clearly considers the proposal to be the eastern boatstore to be constructed over vegetation 12. Not in the public interest	1. 2.4.1, 2.2.2 2. 2.7.1 3. 2.1.8 4. 2.6 5. 2.2 6. Assessment were conducted by experts in traffic, noise, aquatic ecology and planning 7. 2.4.2. Was covered at length in section 4.1 of EA for MOD1 8. Not part of the application 9. 2.7.2. Beyond scope of application 10. 2.5 11. Confusion with incorrect development 12. 2.1.8
108	A Fairweather	1. Out of character with the surrounding area 2. Ignores future potential of White Bay precinct	1. 2.6 2. 2.7.1
109	A Abell	1. Development should be led by a vision coming from the community, not ad hoc 2. Developers are bolting on components to the existing eyesore structures	1. 2.8, 2.7.1 2. Clear confusion with incorrect development

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		based on the precedent that has been set by their existing eyesore structure	
110	M Cashmore 501 Glebe Pt Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hosted a stand at Glebe Point. People aghast that development already approved 2. How can original analysis still be valid? 3. Compromise to water users, forcing them out of the Bay 4. Intrusive and ugly appearance of existing dry boat storage and incredulous that more similar buildings are to be constructed. 5. Need to protect signature locations 6. Community's ability to be aware of and influence outcome is not straightforward 7. Lack of trust 8. Is an entertainment centre – a mini Darling Harbour 9. Premature to Urban Growth master plan 10. The Community Liaison Committee has been a farce, needs to be disbanded 11. Relative peace and quiet but noise from bands and people consuming alcohol will be a source of great annoyance and distress 12. Noise will be an ongoing issue 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Why would it not? 3. 2.4.1, 2.4.2 4. 2.6. Very different to existing Sydney Boathouse building 5. Noted 6. 2.8, 3.1 7. 2.8 8. 2.1.2 9. 2.7.1 10. 2.8.2 11. Bands not part of application. Alcohol will be subject to consideration when liquor licence applications are made 12. 2.2
111	M Barker Ferry Road Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise pollution. Music travels over water 2. Road systems. Traffic is worsening at the western end of the Anzac Bridge and congestion will increase with Harold Park and Cruise Terminal. Bays Precinct should address the traffic issues en masse rather than piecemeal. 3. Public transport is required in the area 4. Should not be rezoning areas for liquor consumption /entertainment uses where there is only access by private motor vehicle 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2 2. 2.3.2 3. 2.3.2 4. No rezoning is proposed
112	P Gibson, Forsyth St Blackwattle Bay	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bigger boats with deep propellers will further churn up the shallow base and release toxins from the bottom 2. You should clean up the old coal disposal plant and cement works adjacent to the Fish Markets 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.5 2. Beyond the scope of the application
113	E Diffey Stewart St Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marine and small scale cafes OK 2. Entertainment precinct with high noise levels not OK eg Liquidity 3. Impacts on lives of residents and bay users 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. 2.1.1 3. 2.2.4
114	H Heckenberg	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic and noise from huge increases will be totally unacceptable to local 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.3, 2.2

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		residents and park and bay users 2. Will be used as an entertainment centre to supplement income from marina berths, being a deliberate attempt to change the land usage 3. No discussion with local community	2. 2.1.1 3. 2.8.1
115	M Dent 501 Glebe Point Rd	1. Grab for more entertainment usage 2. Not allowed under Bays Master Plan 3. Number of car spaces is proportional to an entertainment centre 4. Request for tender boats is a ruse for private boat berthing as superyachts keep their tenders on-board, allowing any non-superyacht vessel in the marina 5. Requires an application under the current legislation 6. Developer creep from increase in berths 7. Entertainment centre masquerading as a marina in a maritime designated area 8. GFC not a valid excuse 9. Profit and pleasure for a few at the expense of the public	1. 1.3, 2.1.1 2. 2.1.1 3. 2.3.1 4. Some do, some do not 5. 2.10 6. 2.1.9 7. 2.1.1 8. 2.9 9. 2.1.6
116	A Hamann	1. Outdoor entertainment 7 days a week until midnight is untenable. Residents are entitled to rest and sleep 2. Entertainment should be limited to either 10pm or indoors	1. 2.2 2. Application does not alter existing conditions about bands
117	J Quin John St Glebe	1. Extending outdoor entertainment will impact on residents by noise 2. Removal of airlocks will have same deleterious effect 3. Increase in yachts means loss of quiet enjoyment for Glebe community and beyond 4. Expansion by stealth should not be allowed	1. 2.2 2. 2.2.1 3. 2.2.2, 2.2.4 4. 2.10
118	C Newton Glebe Point Road Glebe	1. Supposed to be demolished in March 2001 2. Storage is not what the area is meant to be – a working harbour site 3. Planning Department is approving a metal wall 4. Urban renewal should not have to have the wall placed in the way of Bays Precinct development 5. Structure would be better elsewhere, not all in one place – eg should be at Parramatta, Olympic Park Spit 6. Developer greed not planning	1. 2.1.5 2. Storage is an ancillary use to the marina. 2.1 3. Incorrect development. The development is not metal 4. 2.7.1 5. Possible confusion with Sydney Boathouse, 2.6.3

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
			6. 2.1.9
119	M Newton Glebe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to a change of use and increased use 2. Don't want more noise from boats coming and going – access must be restricted to daylight only 3. Ample places in Sydney Harbour to moor boats – no need to be increased. They should be moored near where they are to operate not in a quiet residential area 4. Is a working maritime area, not entertainment district 5. Entire area should be retained as access to the waterfront for use by the public as from Glebe to Secondary College 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted, 1.3 2. 2.2. Vessel access cannot be limited to daylight hours only 3. See discussion in section 4.1.3.7 of EA for MOD 1 re relative scarcity for sites for large vessels 4. 2.1.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.4 5. 2.1.10
120	G Bramich	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on residential amenity re noise from party boats, outdoor entertainment and pollution 2. Impact on recreational water use 3. Public owned waterfront not an entertainment precinct 4. Development creep 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.3, 2.2 2. 2.4.2, 2.4.1 3. 2.1.1, 2.1.7 4. 2.1.9
121	H Havryk	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on residential amenity re noise from party boats, outdoor entertainment and pollution 2. Impact on recreational water use 3. Public owned waterfront not an entertainment precinct 4. Development creep 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.3, 2.2 2. 2.4.2, 2.4.1 3. 2.1.1, 2.1.7 4. 2.1.9
122	BikeSydney	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was temporary 2. Private interests ahead of public 3. Limit potential to develop Glebe Island Bridge as an active transport corridor 4. Does not deliver a viable foreshore link for riders and walkers. Boardwalk is too narrow for concurrent walkers and riders, intends to restrict public access 5. Urban Growth has identified a cycling path along the foreshore and conflicts with Urban Growth 6. Mod includes to cycling links to the site as an objective under Sydney's Cycling Future and Sharing Sydney Harbour Access Plan 2003. Should be provided by s94 Contributions 7. Oversupply of car parks counter to State Government's objectives of reducing personal car trips (NSW 2021) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.5 2. 2.1.8 3. 2.7.21, 3.3.6 4. 2.1.10. Approved foreshore walk not being amended by application 5. 3.2 6. 2.3.3 7. 2.3.1

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
123	Glebe Society, by L Lynch & President T McKeown	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Divergence from SREP 26 and Masterplan 2. Inclusion of water is intended to sidestep the requirements for approval under the existing Part 4 by bringing it within the more flexible Part 3 approval process. Objects to consolidation of land and water. Should use a new Part 4 application 3. Cites Sydney Council letter about inappropriateness of use of Part 3A and Save Our Bays' legal advice 4. Approval has pre-empted integrated planning approach now underway by Urban Growth 5. Cumulative impacts of requested modifications 6. SREP (SH) public land 7. Increase in boats in huge 8. Increased barrier to public foreshore access 9. Problems for safe rowing and other recreational activities 10. Increased intensity of activity 11. Increased traffic implications 12. Requested flexibility leaves a deal of uncertainty as to final uses 13. Cites and attaches Martin Lawrence re noise implications 14. Noise implications on users of Glebe foreshore parks from entertainment related venues 15. Opposed to level 2 addition and the adjacent deck 16. Permission for outdoor seating should be limited in area, subject to a trial period and separate approvals required. 17. Impacts on potential use of Glebe Island Bridge for light rail, pedestrian. Also will be requests to demolish the bridge to allow wider boats 18. Max. bridge clearance width is 18m, but anecdotal evidence is that wider superyachts have passed through 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1.3, 2.1.1 2. 2.10 3. 2.10. See also response to submission 132 4. 2.7.1 5. 2.2, 2.3, 2.6 6. 2.1.8 7. 2.4.2 8. 2.1.10 9. 2.4.2 10. 2.2.2 11. 2.3 12. 3.4.4 13. See submission No. 30 14. 2.2 15. 1.3 16. Application is doing as requested by condition A11 17. 2.7.2, 3.3.6 18. 2.7.2, 3.3.6
124	M Kennedy Forest Lodge	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to size/height and visual scale 2. An enormous parking place for expensive yachts not appropriate for harbour foreshore 3. Was lobbied there for the 2000 games 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.6 2. 2.3.1 3. 2.1.5
125	M Andrews	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Open venues with live bands will destroy peace and pleasure afforded by the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bands not part of application. 2.2

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
	Lewisham	natural quiet	
126	H Sykes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zone maritime not entertainment precinct 2. Was temporary and now zoned for multi-million dollar marina and dryboat 3. Noise from Liquidity and party boats 4. Developer creep will impact on park users, residents, rowers 5. More noise, less control and the bay will be a playground for the super-rich 6. Publicly owned land should be available for the public for their recreation and enjoyment 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1 2. 2.1.5 3. 2.2.3 4. 2.1.9 5. 2.2.2, 2.2.1, 2.1.6 6. 2.1.7
127	T and A McKeown, Glebe Point Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extension of a gross overdevelopment of prime waterfront land which Urban Growth recognises should be publicly accessible 2. Impacts on ability of Glebe Island Bridge to reopen for pedestrian, cycling and light rail use 3. Removal of all existing noise constraints imposed by the PAC 4. Limit use of Bays to traditional users of the waterways eg rowers and dragon boats 5. Not a minor modification 6. Yacht club is an entertainment centre masquerading as a marine facility 7. Favour developer with no countervailing benefits to the community 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.6, 1.3, 2.1.10 2. 2.7.2, 3.3.6 3. 2.2.1 4. 2.4.1, 2.4.2 5. No requirement for this under the Act, however premise is disputed 6. Not part of the application. 2.1.1 7. 2.1.8
128	D Eckstein Rozelle	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Way too bulky in form creating another single-form wall effect and sterilises the visual landscape – cheap design and easy for proponent but impacting negatively on the public domain 2. Cart before the horse – await Urban Growth 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly confused with Sydney Boathouse development 2. 2.7.1
129	K Hailwood Annandale	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assumes approval is for Superyacht marina, dryboat storage and entertainment area 2. Public land 3. Will destroy the beauty, peace and tranquillity of the parkland 4. Developer creep 5. Consider not in isolation to Bays Precinct Plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confused as to extent of application 2. 2.1.7 3. 2.2.4 4. 2.1.9 5. 2.7.1
130	S Zwi Glebe Point Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise from Liquidity – removal of noise constraints 2. Entertainment facility masquerading as a marina 3. Not in the interests of the community 4. Plenty of entertainment venues a short distance which comply with noise 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.1, 2.2.3 2. 2.1.1 3. No details provided 4. 2.1.1

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		regulations and could provide for the boating set	
131	J & L Campano Alexandra Rd Glebe	1. No	1. No details provided
132	HWL Ebsworth on behalf of Save Our Bays	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Includes Martin Lawrence notes re noise 2. Jock Palmer & Assoc <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Significant intensification with substantial increase in environmental affectation and should be refused b. Should have limited environmental consequences beyond those the subject of assessment in the originally approved project c. Overall composition of the development has now radically changed from that which was originally approved d. Original outdoor usage was not specifically disclosed or documented with the original proposal indicates a major intensification of usage e. S75W bears little relationship in terms of the landuse components and development intensity to that originally approved f. Should lodge a separate part 4 for the proposed uses g. Significant alteration of uses and new uses altering land use concept for the site. Should be a new application. h. Intensification and change of use imposes significant increase in environmental affectation re traffic, marine and patron noise generation and marine sediment disturbance i. Traffic flows and traffic noise j. Noise not assessed from additional berths and water activity k. Noise management measures are vague, unenforceable and generally inadequate to ensure no increase in noise affectation l. A full and comprehensive acoustic assessment is required to be undertaken m. Disturbance of toxic sediments, comprehensive analysis is required n. Mod is outside power of the Department to approve because it is intended to have limited environmental consequences 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See submission 30 2. Town Planner <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 2.2.1, 2.6, 2.3 b. Noted, Environmental consequences are slight c. Radical transformation test not approved by Basten JA in <i>Barrick Australia Ltd v Williams</i> [2009] NSWCA 275 d. 2.2.5, Incorrect, it was always included, otherwise it would not have been conditioned and markings placed on the approved plans e. 1.3 f. 2.10, 3.3.1 g. 2.10, 3.3.1 h. Change of use is not proposed. 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 i. 2.3 j. 2.2. See Appendix C k. 2.2.1. They are significant l. Provided. 6 previous assessment were provided for the original approval m. 2.5 n. Noted – consequences are limited
		1. Assessment by HWL Ebsworth	a. Noted, although the proviso in

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Cites <i>Barrick Australia Ltd v Williams</i> para 53 b. Mod is outside the power as it will not have limited environmental consequences beyond those which have been the subject of assessment (water and outdoor seating) c. Water area was not previously assessed in project approval d. To incorporate the 2008 consent into the Part 3A misconceives the Part 3A approval – there is no power to approve the existing water-based development, authorising works that have already been carried out into another approval, particularly if the 2008 consent is surrendered. e. Condition A11(d) indicates that the environmental consequences of outdoor seating are beyond those the subject of the previous assessment f. <i>Wednesbury</i> unreasonableness test. Any decision to approve would be irrational perverse or bizarre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. parentheses is not discussed b. 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6. See proviso in paragraph 53 which specifically indicates additional assessment can occur c. Irrelevant – see paragraph 53 proviso in parentheses d. 3.3.1 e. Incorrect, it does not imply that at all f. This is disputed
133	T & K Morrison Glebe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise from Liquidity and party boats 2. Addition of restaurants and outdoor licensed venues with live bands all day and night disregards the original agreement made with the community 3. No benefit to public by more superyachts 4. Asks for reversal of the latest approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.3 2. 1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.5 3. 2.1.8 4. This would present technical difficulties
134	T Crimmins Lilyfield Rd Rozelle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oppose on basis of noise, water pollution, increase in traffic and safety of the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2, 2.5, 2.3, 2.4.2
135	G Grace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should be temporary – a land grab of the kind Squatters should once be proud of 2. Threatens historic swing bridge 3. Should restore Glebe Island Bridge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.5 2. 2.7.2, 3.3.6 3. Beyond the scope of the application
136	S Freke President Sydney Tsunami Dragon Boat Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further encroach on the limited accessible waterways for training 2. Increase risk of collision and injury 3. Change to an entertainment precinct 4. Insufficient community input 5. Was temporary 6. Alienates the harbour shoreline from the public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.4.1 2. 2.4.2 3. 2.1.1 4. 2.8.1 5. 2.1.5 6. 2.1.10
137	G Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will result in an entertainment and leisure precinct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.1.1

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
	Annandale	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traditionally a working bay coexisting with rowing clubs and later dragon boats Was temporary and expanded over the years – developer creep, developer has gouged so much already Significant noise impacts from the restaurants and bars and entertainment facilities Restricted waterfront access as it will be closed from closing time to 6am for asset security Increased traffic will have huge impact on road network 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.4 2.1.5, 2.1.9 2.2 2.1.10. Incorrect – it will be 24 hour access 2.3
138	Not disclosed Local	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of community consultation. Hoped for a letter drop to local communities, a local consultation meeting Difficult to understand the proposal on the website Bays Precinct consultation didn't mention this proposal. Community wants foreshore walks and public recreation, heritage etc spaces Inappropriate boat storage sheds Increasing number of boats – it is an important water recreation area and quiet. There will be kilometres of superyachts in the quiet bay Superyachts and concrete box storage sheds are completely out of keeping with the community recreation uses and the bay is being overwhelmed by large commercial businesses 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.8, 3.1 It is a pretty standard application 2.7.1. Lodged just prior to the Summit 2.1.10. Not zoned for a park Incorrect development 2.4.1, 2.4.2 Inaccurate. Width of site is approximately 240 metres Storage sheds do not form part of the approved or proposed development. 1.3, 2.1.1
139	C Hughes Summer Hill	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The boat store is ugly and not sympathetic to the surroundings and blocks the view of the old power station Visual impact – new development also has zero architectural merit Listen to the community Noise from Liquidity was a nightmare for park users and residents Entertainment quarter masquerading as a super yacht marina 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Incorrect development Unsure whether this refers to Sydney Boathouse or the modification. 2.6.3 2.1.8, 3.1 2.2.3 2.1.1,
140	K White	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Object 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No details provided
141	Blackwattle Cove Coalition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Endorses the objections of the Glebe Society 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted see No. 123 above
142	P Vines, Hereford St Forest Lodge	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bay is already overfull of superyachts Noise across the water interferes with amenity of residents 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.4.1 2.2

	Submission	Issues Raised	Response
		3. Bays Precinct project will be significantly pre-empted 4. A massive increase in traffic density from Harold Park development with traffic moving from Glebe onto the Anzac Bridge and further traffic will increase problems	3. 2.7.1 4. 2.3
143	G Rutherford, Toxteth Rd Glebe	1. Rozelle Bay is one of the most polluted bays in Sydney Harbour and marinas should not be allowed because of the toxic sediment on the bottom of the Bay. Disturbance will cause pollution. What has changed in the environmental records to allow deep water craft?	1. 2.5
144	M Boland, Albert St Forest Lodge	1. Disastrous effect on current use by rowers, kayakers, dragon boat paddlers 2. The superrich have more influence on the government than ordinary people	1. 2.4.2 2. 2.1.6, 2.1.9
145	A Osborne	1. SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) – public good 2. Few constraints in future 3. See in context of entire Bays Precinct and Glebe Island Bridge 4. Zoned maritime not entertainment 5. Repealing noise controls imposed by the PAC 6. GFC justification not relevant 7. Need community consultation	1. 2.1.8 2. 2.10 3. 2.7.1, 2.7.2, 3.3.6 4. 2.1.1 5. 2.2.1 6. 2.9 7. 2.1.8
146	L Collingwood	1. Noise effects on residents near Rozelle Bay	1. 2.2
147	A Carter	1. Increased boat traffic and dangers from that 2. Noise from live bands	1. 2.4.2 2. Not part of Modification application
148	E Jamil, Glebe Point Road Glebe	1. Project disproportionately favours the wealthy elite, and is socially and economically unjust, spreading inequality. It is capitalism and greed running unchecked	1. 2.1.6
149	Sydney Harbour Association	See comments in Authorities section	