

**From:** [Andrew Pickles SC](#)  
**To:** [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** SSD8544 Hanson Concrete Batching Plant Glebe Island  
**Date:** Monday, 31 May 2021 10:19:44 AM  
**Attachments:** [DOC310521.pdf](#)

---

Dear Commissioners

I made a submission on 9 May 2021 to the application on the IPC portal and wish to make the following additional submissions in relation to the amended documents.

1. The montages – The amended photomontage, particularly the one from Pirrama Park demonstrates the unacceptable impact on views of ANZAC Bridge from the public domain to the east of the site. The impact on the views of the cable stays of the bridge is unacceptable. The obscuring of such iconic views cannot be tolerated. It also highlights the point made by Ross Stitt in his address to the Commission about views from the ANZAC Bridge. Given that the Sydney City Marine buildings were deliberately restricted in their height to preserve views from the Bridge, the position must still be the same today. I have marked up a site plan from the assessment report showing a much better location on Glebe Is than the current proposal. While the site plan from assessment report marks the area I have hatched as being the Western Harbour Tunnel Construction site, in fact that site is located north of the position depicted, more in the location of the words “Glebe Island”. The hatched location would have several advantages:
  - a. It would be partially screened from Pyrmont by the MUF
  - b. It would sit in the foreground of the heritage silos when viewed from Pirrama Park, not in front of the cable stays of the Bridge – I have shown this hatched in red on the photomontage.
  - c. It would be separated from Balmain by the Western Harbour Tunnel construction site and other existing ancillary port structures.
2. The height – The RL’s now provided on the amended east and west elevations along with the detail of the RL for the deck of the Bridge demonstrate the unacceptability of the height proposed for the silos.
3. The letter from the Department seeking to justify the proposal in the context of the long-term strategy for the Bays Precinct simply demonstrates that this has not really been considered at all. There is no real plan for how the concrete batching and MUF might integrate with the rest of the precinct at all. The strategy’s designation of the east of Glebe Is for concrete batching and bulk handling facility post dated the Hanson proposal. The reality is, the Department has no idea how the Glebe Island East precinct is going to integrate with the uses proposed in White Bay for the longer term.
4. The response from Hanson regarding other 24/7 concrete batching operations indicates facilities at Banksmeadow and Greenacre - These facilities are both located within heavy industrial precincts and do not have a residential interface across the water. They are simply not comparable in terms of the potential for adverse impact on a densely populated residential community.

As I indicated previously, in my view the Hanson proposal is wrongly located within Glebe Island. This has been done to meet the desires of the Ports Authority to find a use for a portion of its land otherwise unused, not because any real thought has been given to visual and noise amenity impacts arising from it.

Regards

Andrew Pickles

Andrew Pickles SC

[Redacted]

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards legislation

**Privacy, copyright and confidentiality notice**

This email and any attachment is directed to the addressee only and is confidential. It may be subject to a claim for client legal privilege or contain copyright material. No use may be made of the information nor may it be disclosed to anyone except for the purpose for which it is sent. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender immediately by return email or by telephone on the above number and delete it from your computer.