

5 Jane Street  
Balmain NSW 2041  
18/12/19

To the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

**Re: Submission re: Modification 6 to Major Project Approval MP 10\_0069**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Mod 6 to MP 10\_0069.  
I wish to object to the above Modification Application for the following reasons:

**Inappropriate approval process**

This high impact facility was approved controversially under *Part 3A* of the *EP&A Act* in 2011 and the current conditions (including the limit of 500 visitors to functions) were enforced as a result of hard fought negotiations with the community and local council.

**How is it appropriate to wait a few short years and try to increase the approved number of visitors to FIVE times the limit originally imposed?**

The cruise ship facility (which includes the function centre) is not a good neighbor to local residents who constantly complain about the huge impact that cruise ships have on their lives (particularly in terms of air pollution, but also noise impacts). The Port Authority of NSW has consistently ignored our calls for obvious ways to reduce or mitigate such impacts (such as shore to ship power).

**This facility is not compatible with a medium density residential suburb.**

We have lived in this area for 35 years next to the working boats (bringing sugar, cars, cargo containers etc) that used to frequent White Bay and we never had any issue or registered any complaint until the foul smelling, polluting, noisy cruise ships started arriving in early 2013.

At the time of the original (questionable) approval of the current cruise ship terminal, the community was told it was a ***temporary facility*** while Darling Harbour was being redeveloped. In the years since it has apparently morphed into a *permanent* facility and the Port Authority continually attempts to 'take more' and give back nothing to the community. Recently it sought to exclude ships berthed there on NYE and Australia Day from hard-fought noise restriction standards.

**Inappropriate justification of project modification - for a facility located in a residential suburb**

It is not appropriate to suggest that because the previous facility at Darling Harbour accommodated 3,500 visitors that the White Bay Cruise Ship Terminal (WBCT) should be allowed a similar number (2,500). WBCT is located in a medium density residential suburb - not in Darling Harbour next to the city. The function centre should remain restricted to the original approval conditions as **nothing has changed to reduce any impacts the surrounding community suffers** since the opening of the facility.

**Increased noise and traffic impacts**

We are tired of the interruption to our lives from this facility and see no justification for further noise intrusion in terms of reduced noise monitoring, extended hours of operation and greatly extended numbers of visitors to the function centre. We note that while visitors are apparently encouraged to 'use public transport' (really? - where is there any public transport near this facility?) and charter buses, this is obviously not assured and massively increased visitor numbers will simply result in a huge increase in traffic onto the peninsula. While 'visitor' cars will apparently be directed to James Craig Drive, we note that staff and worker numbers and truck movements for catering, waste and equipment for such functions will all greatly increase and these are likely to use local Balmain Streets via Roberts Road.

**Lack of proper community consultation**

Moreover, once again the lack of proper community engagement in this process has been glaring. While departments like Planning and Roads and Maritime and the local council have apparently been informed, a single mention at a quarterly meeting of the CLG (Community Liaison Group) - which apparently has 5 members from Balmain/Rozelle - is hardly adequate community engagement. Is it left up to one of those local people from the CLG to inform all the affected residents nearby? Once again, I have heard about this very recently only through being on a local email list. Such a major change to the workings of this contentious facility warrants a bit more respect for the affected community and a real attempt to engage with the long-suffering neighbouring residents.

The modification application should be rejected. To interfere with the original conditions of consent by increasing the approved visitor numbers by 5 times would set an appalling precedent for proper process in planning approval decision making.

Helen Gilbert MPIA (retired)