

## Submission Re – Proposed Ferry Wharves at Kurnell and La Peruse

This submission is an objection to the ferry wharf proposed at La Peruse and At Kurnell.

The basis of my objections to this proposal are threefold:

1. It is an unnecessary and overdevelopment on an already heavily used site.
2. It is likely to cause further deterioration of the underwater and inter-tidal marine environment
- 3 It will alienate yet more land originally the property of the local aboriginal community.

While a student at UNSW in 1977 I completed a scuba course run by the university. Since that time I have dived both the Bare Island and Kurnell / Kamay National Park dive sites. In this time I have observed deterioration and diminution of a number of marine species most significantly the weedy sea dragon. This current proposed development rings many alarm bells that have been ignored in the past to the detriment of 'The Bay'

I will address each point in turn.

1. I have regularly dived Bare Island over the past forty four years. In the seventies I could arrive at any time during the weekend, secure a park near the Bare Island bridge and go diving. More recently I rarely dive of a weekend. When I do must I arrive at around 8.00am so as to secure a park close to the access to the dive sites. By 9.00am even in winter there is unlikely to be any parking spots anywhere in the whole carpark. When I am drying off and changing at say 10.30 there are usually multiple cars backed up and vying for my spot – unfortunately I usually have a nice warm coffee and cake to get the body started again.

When I drive out of the car park on a warm sunny day there are always cars parked as far back as the Anzac Pde intersection and in all the side streets. The residents must love it. Randwick Council has vicariously acknowledged this problem by recently introducing four hour parking in the whole of the La Peruse car park.

My question to you is – Where will the parking for this ferry be. If it has a four hour limit its going to be a very short visit to Kurnell/Kamay NP. This site is already heavily used nay overused. It doesn't need more development.

2. While studying at UNSW among other science subjects I took courses in Physical Geography, General and Coastal Geomorphology and Biogeography. Due its proximity Botany bay and the Kurnell Peninsular copped a fair bit of attention. The development of the third runway, the proposed Port Botany facility and the fabulous giant barrier dunes of the Kurnell Peninsular (remember them). There was a lot of predictions. On one hand were the effects which may result from changed wave patterns, different tidal flows and tidal pathways. Other concerns related to the effect of increase silt load and water turbidity on marine flora and fauna.

The possibility of erosion of adjacent and opposite shorelines was predicted and has come to pass. Bayside council now needs to regularly nourish the Ramsgate foreshore due to the disappearance of sand and the shoreline of the wetland opposite takes a beating from refract/reflected wave.

The dredging and subsequent construction of Port Botany destroyed vast amounts of seagrass and juvenile fish nursery. Anecdotally I have heard that the annual hairtail migration, formerly near the location of the recent Port Botany extension, is no longer occurring to the extent, if at all, that it once was.

As a diver in the seventies I regularly saw good numbers of weedy sea dragons every dive both at Bare Island and Kurnell. The construction of Port Botany and its subsequent extension stopped that dead. I haven't seen a sea dragon at Bare Island since the beginning of Port Botany construction. At Kurnell they have just began to return but not in the numbers I saw early in my diving career. There have been some recent sightings at Bare Is by other divers but not in any numbers. These creatures are obviously very sensitive to changes in their physical environment. It can probably also be assumed that there are many less exotic creatures similarly sensitive to changes in their environment.

I fear that the initial construction and then ongoing operation of ferry wharves at both Kurnell and La Perouse is likely to again distress the sea dragons and other creatures to the point where there completely die out around Bare Is and likely permanently diminish in numbers at Kurnell.

3. I am not of aboriginal descent. I do not know how the local indigenous people feel about this development. The indigenous people of La Perouse can demonstrate continuous occupation of the La Perouse Botany Bay area. They have used these lands and waters to nourish and house their families for many thousands of years. Since occupation their land has been incrementally removed from their possession for the benefit of others.

In the 1830's Governor Burke granted land in the Botany area to Mahroot, a local indigenous man. Most likely this land encompassed some of the current Port Botany and adjacent land. Unfortunately others had eyes for this land and took it. Most of the land once traditionally used by the local indigenous people has been alienated from them. A recent proposal for a cruise liner terminal was set to remove the last remaining section of the once expansive eastern Botany Bay foreshore from traditional and cultural use.

This ferry wharf, as proposed, will desecrate what is essentially an unaltered, intact rock platform. Ignoring the fort and bridge associated with Bare Island it is area which is not that different now to its appearance at the time of colonisation.

As I stated I cannot presume to speak for the local indigenous people but I strongly argue that they must be included and seriously listened to in any discussion and considerations regarding this ferry wharf. To not do so would be yet another disservice to these continuous occupiers and custodians of this site.

Thankyou for your consideration of my thoughts on this issue.

Paul Soares