

I write to strongly object to the proposal for the Hansen concrete plant on Glebe island for the following reasons noting it is inconceivable that such a proposal is being seriously considered given the environmental risks and the known impacts of the related pollutants particularly the noise.

Planning to build such an industrial complex in residential Sydney on the largest natural harbour in the world is both disingenuous and a threat to the quiet enjoyment rights of the residents of Pymont and Balmain.

My specific concerns centre on:

- 1. Air Quality** – Underestimation of impacts by Hanson as selective data used. The Todoroski Air Quality report of 18/12/20 points out a contradiction in the application whereby air filters are a requirement but not mentioned in the application. Hanson also have no experience in air quality management.
- 2. Bunker pollution** - The use of Low Sulphur fuel is very concerning as there is no evidence of compliance enforcement at White Bay cruise terminal.
- 3. Diesel fumes** - Concentrated Heavy Vehicle movements. The Air Quality impact Assessment references 7000 truck movements daily. An inconsistency with Traffic Impact Assessment.
- 4. Traffic** – The scheduled number of trucks add significantly to an already congested area in both morning and afternoon peaks. Additionally, the number of workers private vehicles have not been accounted for as limited public transport options are available to the area.
- 5. Vessel Standard** - Hanson is unable to guarantee the vessel used to transport aggregates will be able to comply with the EPA's noise and vibration requirements, noting that the requirements are technical and potentially expensive, and the vessel is yet to be certified to meet these requirements.
- 6. Visual Amenity** – Hanson only agreed to investigate the visual amenity requirements raised by the City of Sydney and passed the responsibility onto the landowner The Port Authority, who have no strategy in place nor experience in visual amenity.
- 7. Shipping Movements** – Hanson's submission refers only to the noise generated from unloading berthed ships. Hanson does not take into account the operation of vessels or vessel movements. This neglect leaves out the noise generated by tugs and the ships propulsion units which are running at power during the manoeuvres required to berth and depart. Vessel movements will also create additional congestion on the harbour which is now being enjoyed more by recreational and light commercial vessel operation.
- 8. Noise and Vibration** – Hanson are unrealistically optimistic about their ability to control the noise landside. They take limited responsibility for noise generated by shipping vessels. Vibration from ships propulsion systems have been overlooked. The deep notes of the vessel's machinery may not be exceedingly loud when measured but the vibration is a significant factor. This cannot be measured until the ship is certified. Additionally, while Hanson compares this to other batch sites, no other site has ship movements or is as big. The comparisons are misleading. In a response to a question raise Parliament (4187) by MP Alex Greenwich the Port Authority stated, 'The Port Noise Policy and Vessel Noise Operating Protocol aims to manage noise from commercial shipping in a way that that is acceptable to the local community...' This has not been done.

9. **24/7 Operation** – Hanson claims that they are unable to accept a curfew as their shipping operations are dependent on weather and cannot fit to a suitable schedule. This is unacceptable. There are Port Authority imposed restrictions on cruise vessels movements during peak times and the same can be imposed. Hanson will need to make the appropriate arrangement to meet the curfew. Operations during the night will have significant light and noise impacts. Operations on the Northern side of the facility have less of an impact on residence and have fewer movements.
10. **Contravention of existing strategic plans** – No timeline on lease. Both containers and vehicles have been removed from the harbour. There is no reason why bulk goods should be bought back and contravene years of NSW Government strategy. A move away from the NSW Governments Bays precinct strategic plans and for the plans to bring more jobs and growth to an underutilised area that could host a tech hub or other growth industries which NSW is falling behind on.
11. **Alternatives** – No infallible reason has been put forward yet regarding why this site is the only option. The NSW Government promised that the Connex road network would take more Heavy vehicles off the road network. In particular, the network was to provide easy access from Botany Bay to the entire Sydney region for freight. Botany Bay should be the alternative location with the purpose built Connex road network utilised for the purpose it was built for and the Government demonstrate that they are able to commit to their promises. The vacant site between the Hutchison and Patricks facilities is a perfect location.
12. **Lack of Public trust** – If this was to go ahead there would be damage to the reputation and trust in the NSW Government. Time and money have been spent on strategic visions for the area by residence, community groups and the Government. Government has made promises that have encouraged investment in the area by businesses and families. The Government now appears to be breaking those promises. Much emphasis has been placed on the responsibility of the Port Authority by Hanson. The Port Authority in the past has shown incompetence in dealing with the concerns of the community, particularly in regard to the cruise ship terminal at White Bay. While a rough compromise was reached in regard to White Bay, the Port Authority demonstrated that it was incapable in this regard. Additionally, Hanson have failed to adequately address community concerns from previous consultations and the prior form of companies such as Hanson to overstep and face insignificant compliance enforcement is known.