

Good morning

My name is Stephen Paull and I am a resident of the Sugardock building that looks across to Glebe Island and I object to the Hanson proposal.

My wife and I downsized to Pyrmont because of its central location and the obvious potential for the precinct. Frankly, I thought we'd struck gold when moved to Pyrmont given the NSW government's exciting vision for the Glebe Island/White Bay precinct documented in various strategic plans, with the most recent being the Bays West Strategic Plan.

Sadly it has been all downhill from there....

I'm quite aware that I could be accused of being a NIMBY for objecting to this proposal, however, most people would have a problem with a proposal that results in 24/7 noise pollution, air pollution, light pollution and traffic congestion a couple of hundred metres from their home.

The objections to all of these issues have been well documented, and whilst the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment believes that the conditions placed on the applicant to mitigate the issues are acceptable, residents surrounding the site would argue otherwise.

Given time constraints, rather than re-hashing objections about the likely outcomes of a concrete batching plant, I thought it relevant to make some observations around the process that underpins the DPIE's recommendation to accept the Hanson proposal:

1. My first observation is that most conclusions are based on "predicted data" that bear no resemblance to lived experience. Has anyone looked at Hanson's compliance history in other areas and asked residents that live near existing concrete batching plants if the dust levels are acceptable?
2. Secondly, conditions imposed on Hanson by the DPIE include, and I quote, "strict noise criteria based on the best achievable noise levels identified by the Applicant" AND the Applicant has committed to mitigation measures that includes minimising ship noise, quote "as much as practicable"I respectfully ask any of the IPC members if they would be comforted by these conditions if they lived near Glebe Island?
3. My third observation is that there is no conditional end date on the Hanson tenure....so the Port Authority lease will determine how long

Hanson occupy the site. I suggest that decisions of tenure negotiated between Hanson and the Port Authority will be driven by financial necessity and return on capital rather than the Bays West Strategic Plan. In my opinion, there is a conflict of interest in this case and the Port Authority should NOT negotiate the tenure.

4. My next observation is that the Hanson proposal has been looked at in isolation, as was the MUF and other proposals for the precinct. Very little work, if any has been done to analyse the cumulative precinct noise, air, light and traffic pollution of all the proposals combined.
5. Another point to note is that the Hanson proposal has been deemed a SSD and the DPIE state that it is in the public interest. I question if it is in the public interest to approve a SSD without some sort of tender process, especially in light of the criticism heaped on the government for allowing Crown to proceed without tender
6. Finally, the Port Authority have consistently argued that Glebe Island is a “working port”, even though it has not been legitimately used as a working port since 2008, when cars were offloaded there. So, if having a working port is so critical, why are they proposing to add a concrete batching plant, or any sort of manufacturing facility for that matter that removes the functionality of a working port? If Glebe Island is going to be used to manufacture concrete, accommodate overflow from the Rozelle Interchange and store toxic waste from the Western Harbour Tunnel.....do we actually need a working port in the middle of Sydney Harbour?

This is a perfect segue to my final and most critical reason for my objection....

I have screen shared artists impressions of what is proposed vs what could be.

As I mentioned earlier, the DPIE concluded that the Hanson proposal “is in the public interest”. I actually believe that the Hanson proposal BUILT ON THIS SITE is NOT in the public interest. There is an enormous opportunity cost for Sydney, NSW and Australia in allowing the Hanson proposal together with other developments like the Multi-User Facility on Glebe Island. If we kept the tram shed on Bennelong Point, we wouldn't have an Opera House. If we kept the wharves at Millers Point, we wouldn't have a Barangaroo.

Turning Glebe Island into a manufacturing site is not in the public interest and should not be allowed to proceed.

As a Post Script to all of my comments today, I belatedly read the publicly available transcript from the IPC meeting with the DPIE on 6 May 2021 and it reminded me of a scene from the movie, A Few Good Men where Jack Nicholson says the famous line....."you want the truth, you can't handle the truth". This transcript is disturbing to read and justifies my opinion that the DPIE assessment places too much faith in the Applicant and their assessment and recommendation is flawed.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.



Artist Impression – Don't Waste Glebe Island website



Hanson's photo from the Visual Impact Assessment



Artist Impression – Don't Waste Glebe Island website



Artist Impression – Arterra Interactive/Rob Miriams

Urban Task Force quote – “to use the island for building materials and concrete batching plants would miss an amazing opportunity”