

David Gordon Objection to:

Glebe Island Aggregate Handling Facility and Concrete Batching Plant SSD 8544

I am writing as a follow up to my verbal submission of 17th May 2021, objecting to SSD 8544.

2012 – Jacksons Landing Completion Ceremony

On the 27th November 2012 at 12:00pm, I attended the Jacksons Landing Completion Ceremony, where guest speakers The Hon Andrew Stoner Deputy Premier and Mr Richard (Dick) Persson, Chairman of the Harbour Foreshore Authority, spoke eloquently of how Jacksons Landing represented a shining example of a vision being realised through the hard work of Government and industry by turning a disused heavily polluted industrial site into a world leading example of mixed use business and residential urbanisation.

However, in April 2018 Hanson in concert with the NSW Port Authority commenced a process to destroy this vision and set the clock back, to an industrial era not in keeping with this vision.

Transparency in Dealings – NSW Port Authority

The Port Authority's resort to "commercial in confidence" as justification for not releasing any details of its lease agreement with Hanson, is a huge red flag.

Should the IPCN approve SSD 8544, I believe it will be necessary at a minimum that the Auditor General review this lease so as to ensure probity and reassure the people of NSW.

Process of DPIE Assessment

It has taken three years to reach this point in the assessment process for SSD 8544 which is also a warning sign that all is not well with this application. The DPIE in my opinion has bent over backwards to accommodate Hanson. There have been significant inconsistencies in Hanson statements on the fate of the Hymix plant in Banks Street. Given para 1.5.2 in the DPIE assessment report, I find Mr Witherdins' answer to Commissioner Tuor's question 30 in the Stakeholder Meeting between the IPCN and DPIE perplexing. Hanson didn't put para 1.5.2 into the assessment.

Hanson Commitment to Shipping

I am genuinely concerned with Hanson's commitment to shipping materials from its Bass Point Quarry to Glebe Island. The Commission may or may not be aware but the Bass Point terminal needs a significant and costly upgrade.

If you add the anticipated \$22M to be spent on the batching plant and aggregate handling facility to the Bass Point terminal upgrade and given likely overruns and mounting costs, the breakeven for a return on investment means these facilities have to be profitable over a considerable period.

It can be seen from the following that Hanson is wholly dependent on the IPCN approving SSD 8544 before it will in any way commit to shipping gravel to Sydney. Indeed a decision regarding ship usage would appear to be "market driven" which implies no firm commitment to shipping.

The following is an extract from Page 3 of the Minutes of a meeting of the Bass Point Quarry Community Consultative Committee, Wednesday 20th March 2019:-

<https://www.hanson.com.au/media/6417/bass-point-2019-03-march-ccc-minutes.pdf>

Planning has commenced for the:

- *Demolition of the existing plant – tenders closed on 15th March 2019, exact date TBC .*
- *Upgrade of the existing pier (a.k.a. the “jetty” or “gravel loader”) (estimated for 2020). Design of the ship loading system is pending confirmation of the ship specifications, and ultimately, will be determined by the market. VS queried the date of commission of the current pier; SB confirmed that it was commissioned in the 1970s. LB queried the status of the new Sydney plant (as this has been linked to the commissioning of a new ship); SB and SS confirmed that there are no new updates. VS queried whether commissioning a new ship will reduce the number of trucks on the road, or if production would instead increase. Both VS and LB asserted that it would be beneficial for road users if the number of trucks on the road was reduced. SB confirmed that production is market -driven (based on consumer demand) so there is no definitive answer.*

Thank you for the opportunity to present my views.

Yours sincerely

David S Gordon