SUBMISSION TO THE INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

**Re: Glebe Island Aggregate Handling Facility and Concrete Batching Plant SSD 8544**

I am writing as a private citizen, and not in my capacity as Chairman of the Jacksons Landing Coalition, although the information I have learned over the past three years does of course inform my opinions. JLCI has made a separate submission.

My wife and I have lived in Sugardock Terrace since July 2016. Before we purchased here, we read the “Bays Transformation Plan 2015” and were impressed with what it had to say about the Pyrmont area. It mentioned that Glebe Island would have some “maritime activities” on it at some stage. The inference clearly was that it would be developed as a combination of low-rise residential, offices, retailers, coffee shops and the like, combined with parkland and walkways for all Sydney residents to enjoy. My wife is an architect, and we both looked forward to the development of the area as per that State Government plan.

Fast forward to 2021 and the news that the DPI&E is recommending approval of a proposal by Hanson Australia to build a concrete batching plant on Glebe Island. We listened carefully to what was presented at the public meeting held by the IPC on 17 May 2021 and wish to add our voice to the many residents who protested strongly against the approval of what Hanson is proposing.

The biggest worry from our point of view is that the DPI&E itself has done a very poor job assessing the Hanson proposal, accepting a number of half-truths and self-serving interpretations from Hanson as if they were gospel. They gave Hanson more than three years to submit and process their EIS, and many extensions of time to answer questions raised by JLCI and others. It is our contention that those issues were not properly addressed or answered by Hanson, and the DPI&E seems to have meekly accepted pretty much whatever Hanson had to say.

**What would we like to see?**

1. That the IPC reject the DPI&E recommendation, or at least require full and proper answers to the many questions which were raised.

2. If the IPC does approve the proposal at the very least the IPC should impose several conditions on that approval, including: -

1. A curfew on the Hanson plant operating between the hours of 7 p.m. and 7 a.m.
2. Proper controls of the noise levels of ships entering and leaving Glebe Island and especially the tugs which assist them arriving and departing. By “proper controls” we do not accept the “slap on the wrist” penalties which the Port Authority has used until now, such as a phone call or letter to ship owners, long after the ship has departed. We mean substantial financial penalties which would cause ships to comply with and not ignore the noise guidelines as they do now.
3. A schedule of the times each quarter when the EPA and other relevant Government bodies must measure and report on noise levels of the Hanson operation, along with the ships it brings in, as well as air quality levels. Unless the IPC sets these conditions in writing, nobody will measure or monitor noise and air quality levels, nor will any penalties ever be imposed for infringements.
4. There was some inference by Hanson and the DPI&E that the EPA not only sets standards for noise levels and air quality, it somehow has a part in holding organisations and businesses to account if and when those standards are exceeded. That is not the case. I have had three meetings with the EPA in the past three years, and each time they have emphasised they ar**e not** the policeman, and they only recommend standards to the State Government. Once accepted, those standards have to be policed by others, and the EPA has nothing whatever to do with monitoring levels or prosecuting offenders.

If either Hanson or the DPI&E object to anything we have stated, we would be delighted to debate these matters with them in front of the IPC and have those proceedings placed on the public record.

We have no objection to the NSW Port Authority conducting maritime activities on Glebe Island. This would include berthing and repair of ships, loading and unloading cargo, storing marine cargo and the like.

By no stretch of the imagination could a concrete batching plant be called a “maritime activity”. It would be a noisy, dust-making, highly profitable commercial manufacturing plant which could and should be located elsewhere, not within about 200 metres of the high-density residential area which Pyrmont has become.

Yours Sincerely,

Christopher D Levy

7/25 Bowman St Pyrmont NSW 2009.