



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1461573

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

GLEBE ISLAND CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT AND AGGREGATE HANDLING FACILITY – STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

APPLICANT MEETING

SSD 8544

IPC PANEL:

ANNELISE TUOR (Chair)

DR PETER WILLIAMS

OFFICE OF THE IPC:

CASEY JOSHUA

JULIAN ARDAS

APPLICANT:

SCOTT TIPPING (Hanson)

ANDREW DRIVER (Hanson)

ASHLEIGH ZARLENGA (Hanson)

TIM WARD (Ethos Urban)

SYDNEY

11.00 AM, THURSDAY, 6 MAY 2021

MS A. TUOR: So good morning and welcome to this meeting. Before we begin I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the different lands from which we meet today and pay my respect to the elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss SSD 8544 for the proposed Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant and Aggregate Handling Facility Project currently before the Commission for determination. The applicant, Hanson Construction Materials Pty Ltd, is seeking approval for an Aggregate Handling Facility and Concrete Batching Plant at Glebe Island. The project would have the capacity to produce up to one million cubic metres of concrete per annum and operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

My name is Annelise Tuor and I'm the chair of the Commission panel. I am joined today by my fellow Commissioner, Dr Peter Williams. We are also joined by Casey Joshua from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission and Julian Ardas who is assisting the Commission. In the interest of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. The meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will then put up on our website. To ensure the accuracy of the transcript, we request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other. So now if we start with the introductions. So Andrew, do you want to go first and then introduce your team.

MR A. DRIVER: My name is Andrew Driver. I'm the development manager for Hanson Construction Materials New South Wales. I'm joined by ASHLEIGH ZARLENGA who is a development planner for Hanson. Also joined by SCOTT TIPPING who is our regional general manager and TIM WARD who is a director at Ethos Urban.

MS TUOR: All right. Well, thank you all for coming this morning. Before we get started I just want to clarify, we had the request yesterday about seeking an amendment to your application. We haven't had a chance to look at that request in any detail so the discussion today is on the basis of the application that was considered and assessed by the department and forwarded to the IPC for its determination. But I understand from your letter that you offered to explain the proposed amendments to us so, as part of today's discussion, that would be good if you could actually explain the changes that you're seeking to have – like, for an amended application. I also understand that you're going to do a presentation so how long is that presentation – do you expect that will go?

MR DRIVER: I'll try and keep it as short as possible. It's about 24 slides and I'll run through it as fast as I can but I'm expecting it to be about 20 minutes.

5 MS TUOR: Yes. Okay. Good. Try and not go over the 20 minutes because we have quite a few matters on the agenda that we need to get through and we went over a bit in our previous meeting with the department. All right. So if you want to start with the presentation.

10 MR DRIVER: So I've tried to – looking at your agenda, I've tried to address matters raised in the agenda in the presentation.

MS TUOR: Good.

15 MR DRIVER: And I will have pause points and you can ask questions and then we can always circle back and make sure that we've ticked off everything on your agenda.

MS TUOR: Good. Thank you.

20 MR DRIVER: All right. How do I share my screen. My screen has been disabled.

MS C. JOSHUA: Sorry, I'm just activating that now.

25 MR DRIVER: Thank you.

MS JOSHUA: Are you able to try again?

30 MR DRIVER: Yes. So I'm not too sure which screen you're seeing me. Are you seeing the slide notes or are you seeing the actual slides?

MS TUOR: We're seeing slides, four on a page.

MS JOSHUA: We're seeing the notes.

35 MR DRIVER: Okay. Sorry about that. I've got it this time.

MS TUOR: Not yet. Yes. That's it now.

40 MR DRIVER: Fantastic. Sorry about that

MS JOSHUA: That's all right.

45 MR DRIVER: Okay. I'll just with my okay. So this presentation is about the Concrete Batch Plant and Aggregate Handling Facility of Glebe Island. I will first start off with the why and the importance of concrete aggregates concrete is used in almost all construction projects. These types of construction projects are fundamental to and a reliable local concrete supply is a foundation projects.

Efficiently and in an environment sustainable way. Concrete batch plants are however operate in an inflexible manner and this means 24/7 which is becoming increasingly more of a construction project and we need to have adequate production capacity, not just on an annual basis but also on an hourly, weekly and
5 monthly. And we need a response that meets the construction and design requirements on project delivery programs.

Furthermore, concrete batching plants need to be located in as close proximity as possible to areas for example, major project specifications – and this is with
10 Transport for New South Wales and RMS. They can require concrete to be delivered and placed on site within 45 minutes from when its batched and mixed with water. So in terms of Glebe Island and site future demand than Sydney CBD which is able to offer these three attributes.

15 So why Glebe Island. Well, according to the supply and demand profile of geological construction materials for the greater Sydney region, there was a report commissioned by the Department of Planning back in 2019. And that report revealed that per capita consumption of extracted materials, which doesn't include recycling materials, this is materials, is about 3.5 tonnes per person, per annum.
20 And if we have a look at the figure on the left-hand side, that would be roughly the catchment – the supply catchment of the Glebe Island facility.

If you have a look at the breakdown of the population within the LGAs in that catchment, you're looking at about a million people. Each one of those people will
25 about 3.5 million tonnes per annum. To put that in further context, Glebe Island Concrete Batch Plant will be a critical part of the Hanson concrete supply network and Hanson currently supplies about 35 per cent of concrete requirements within that radius circle that I just previous slide.

30 Based on supply requirements of around 3.5 million tonnes per annum for the Sydney CBD and surrounding areas, Hanson's propose Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant should have the capacity to metres and this will require two million tonnes of aggregates to produce that. The current location of concrete batch plant with an aggregate facility offers several logistical benefits which include
35 the removal of 65,000 trucks from Sydney's major arterial roads, access to deep water ports enabling bulk importation by ship, a location which is very approximate to the demand to make a batch concrete in that critical 45 minute window.

Hanson, as I said, is also a major supplier of aggregates to major government
40 infrastructure projects. For example, at the moment we're supplying to WestConnex. We supply about 1000 cubic metres of concrete per day which is 2000 tonnes of aggregates. And we're supplying over 300,000 cubic metres of concrete per annum which is 600,000 tonnes of aggregates. And we do this on day, night, Sundays and public holiday basis so having that flexibility to be 24/7 is actually crucial.

45 Hanson will also tender and supply on major projects up and coming. These include the Crows Nest Station which is 4000 cubic metres or equivalent to 80,000 tonnes;

Pitt Street Station, 50,000 cubic metres, 100,000 tonnes; Barangaroo, 50,000 cubic metres, 100,000 tonnes; Metro West, 200,000 or 400,000 tonnes of aggregates; the Warringah Freeway upgrade, another 100,000 or 200,000 tonnes of aggregates; the Western Harbour Tunnel, which will be based out of Glebe Island, 100,000 cubic metres, 200,000 tonnes – the equivalent aggregates and the big one, the Northern Beaches link, 400,000 cubic metres or 800,000 tonnes of aggregates. So across these projects you're looking at about 2.5 million tonnes of aggregates to support those projects and these are all government projects.

10 Why is Glebe Island important in terms of we're investing more than 22 million critical secure the reliable supply of concrete and aggregates to support, not only the construction industry but the continuation of Sydney's economic our New South Wales government's to maintain the last major working industrial port on Sydney Harbour. And also the New South Wales government has already approved Hanson to export aggregates, up to four million tonnes per annum from Bass Point Quarry. So logically, an approval of this at the quarry will require within close proximity to the consumer markets.

20 Maintaining Glebe Island as an aggregates allows for possible source of quarry materials outside of the Sydney area which, as we all know, Sydney has limited life of resources around the Sydney basin. And again, this type of commitment, both financially and altogether all the resources, it will be a key for both Sydney and Hanson a long-term tenure is sensible and it's paramount to ensure not only the required return investment but also to support all the points above.

25 So just quickly, the location, the site – and I'm sure you are all familiar with this but I will just take the opportunity to point out a few things on the right-hand side. So this is the proposed Hanson site. This is the multi-user facility around as you can see, in terms of footprint, it's a larger footprint. Glebe Island the balance of the island is earmarked for the construction site for the Western Harbour Tunnel, existing silos on the old Glebe Island Bridge is there and

30 So Glebe Island has historically been used as a shipping container terminal for grain and imports and transportation of bulk construction materials such as cement and gypsum. It is one of the last remaining ports in close proximity to the CBD. Glebe Island is currently used common user berths for bulk imports etcetera. So it's not uncommon that these sort of materials that we're proposing be – have already been historically.

40 In terms of the Hanson facility, I know we met on site last Friday but I will just again point out some of the features of our site. This is the batch building in here which is fully enclosed, not partially. This is the aggregate silo storage area. The ships will be transfer material by an onboard conveyor system to a receivable here which will then transport the material up to the silos. Carparking, truck parking, the flow of vehicles, trucks will come in through here, they will go around back, entering here to be loaded. That's the concrete side of things. The come in to receive aggregates from there and the depot will come in around the back adjacent to the

shipping container underneath the aggregate silos they will receive the aggregates from the storage silos above and then they will underneath the old Glebe Island Bridge and on to I suppose – at this point, are there any questions from anyone?

5

MS TUOR: Just a question in terms of the photo montage that is shown there, when I look at the plans that are currently before us, the silos are just shown as a blank wall and they don't have that roof projecting over the edge. And also my understanding is that – from being on site – was that they would not be – they're shown as a lot higher than the deck of the ANZAC Bridge. So I'm just wondering, is that photo montage based on an earlier scheme or is it meant to represent the current scheme? I know we will get on to this later but just - - -

10

MR DRIVER: Sure. No, it's a good question. So the photo montage was part of the original EIS and was part of the original layout. So in the original layout we still had some silos. The storage size was the same but they were round, as you can see there. We then changed the shape to a square size and that was to do with the buildability, having spoken to contractors who do this sort of construction work. On the original proposal in the EIS, you can see there's an aggregates receivable bin that will take the material from a ship and then transfer it directly up to the silos. On the one that was RTS we had a transfer system and part of the – what we're now proposing is to return back to this straight line approach because it's a transfer point which – for a couple of reasons. It's a little bit difficult to build but every time there's a transfer point in the conveying system it drags so a straight line between A and B is preferred option.

20
25

MS TUOR: Thank you.

MR DRIVER: the question, Annelise?

30

DR P. WILLIAMS: Could I ask a question, Annelise?

MS TUOR: Yes, of course. Of course.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, thanks – thanks, Annelise. Andrew, the point that Annelise was making is this overhang on the photo montage. That just doesn't seem to be accurate in terms of the plans that we've got. And also we wondered whether there is still the need for the pitched roof on the top of the silos. And I guess that's to do with the angle of the conveyor here. Does that have to be at that angle? Can it be a little bit lower to remove the need for the – so you can lower it a little bit to remove the need for the pitched roof?

35
40

MR DRIVER: That's one of the details that we're working through. The pitched roof was put on there very early on in the consultations with some of the key stakeholders. And it was about trying to make it look more of a common structure having a gable roof as opposed to – if you have a look at the silos behind – the old Glebe Island silos, the cement silos and the sugar silos, instead of having that, sort of,

45

box shape it will give it some sort of, you know, articulations and point of interest. The overhang is not that critical but if we remove the overhang we would need to support that cantilever that's shown in the montage by some other structure. So we – and again, it's – we're working on it and we think we have a solution for it but – and
5 that's why we wanted to talk about that at some point with - - -

MS TUOR: Okay. It's just that the current elevations don't have that overhang in the - - -

10 MR DRIVER: And the reason for that – if I go back here, is that before it went from the on the wharf – just as you walk straight up to this point here and it required an overhang to – for that transfer to occur. We then moved away from that to having a transfer point here and then up the conveyor centrally into the middle of the storage silos.

15 MS TUOR: And the pitched roof, has that actually got capacity for storage or does the go up the top of the concrete?

MR DRIVER: Yes – no, the aggregates will go up to – the storage will go up to this
20 level here but that pitched roof would house the overhead conveyor system. So if you like, there's a – this conveyor, whether it's this one or this one here, would distribute the material onto another conveyor that runs along this way and that conveyor would then have the aggregate down into the silo bins on either side.

25 MS TUOR: So you need a certain amount of height above the height of the concrete silos in which the aggregate is stored.

MR DRIVER: Yes. You need a bit of roof space for that activity to occur.

30 MS TUOR: And roughly what sort of – how many metres do you need for that extra height?

MR DRIVER: Not off the top of my head but I would say – and Scott, feel free to
35 offer your opinion, but I think it would probably be in the order of four to five metres.

MS TUOR: Okay. Thank you.

40 MR S. TIPPING: We can certainly come back if you want more specific detail on what the minimum would be.

MS TUOR: Yes. Okay. Thank you. And that would need to go along the whole
45 length of the silos for your system - - -

MR DRIVER: For the conveyor system.

MS TUOR: To go along. Yes. Okay.

MS JOSHUA: Can I ask a question?

5 MS TUOR: Yes, of course. Yes.

MS JOSHUA: Andrew, can I just ask you to clarify something for the
Commissioners. Did you say that there are still design components that you are
considering even beyond the RTS plans and the amended plans that were sent
10 yesterday?

MR DRIVER: In detail, in terms of footprint, locations I think we're
comfortable with that but there are always little minor details that may be picked up
on plans of this level, to be honest.

15

MS JOSHUA: Thank you.

MS TUOR: All right.

20 MR DRIVER: So I'll move on.

MS TUOR: Move along.

MR DRIVER: So I think we're all familiar with this, concrete batch with
25 one million cubic metres handling facility with shipping capacity – ability
height over the silos. To put that in context, they're surrounded by significant tall
structures such as the ANZAC Bridge and the Glebe Island silos, which are 70
metres, and the across the water at Pyrmont are 65 metres high.

30 MS TUOR: I will just interrupt you again, Andrew. On site, I think we tried to
work out what the height of the Glebe Island silos was, up to the top of the concrete
and then below the height of the advertising sign, and I think – I can't remember
what the figure was but it was a lot less than 70 metres. And there seems to be – just
on the information we've got from various sources – different indications of what the
35 height is. So is that something that you would be able to clarify for us, just what an
RL is of the to the top of the concrete and then you can give an overall one as
well, if you like, but - - -

MR DRIVER: I'll take that on notice. I took this extract from the - - -
40

MS TUOR: Yes, I know. I know. I recognise where it's the department's
report. And we've asked them the same question. But if you could get back to us
just with the RL height of those concrete silos to the bottom of the advertising sign
and then if you want to do one that goes to the overall height and also just their width
45 and length as well because they're a good reference point to work out just the scale
of what's proposed. If we know this is – your proposal is, you know, certain degree

lower and half as long then we can, sort of – that gives us a, sort of, way of estimating it.

5 The other RL we're looking for is just the height of the road level of the ANZAC Bridge. And because it changes in elevation, just an RL where it is at the structure, at that point, the structure that's closest - - -

MR DRIVER: Yes.

10 MS TUOR: The arch structure that's closest to your facility. That would be a good reference point as well.

MR DRIVER: So a proposal for 15 metre high concrete batching plant which is five metres lower than the multi-user and it will also incorporate six silos – cement
15 silos for the environment the from the ship will be 7.8 metres high and that will be the same height as the shipping containers which are stacked the majority of the activities will be able to building to limit noise and impacts. I don't know where the – I know it ended up in the department's assessment but I don't know where the words “partially enclosed” came from. That's not the case.

20 Just a quick brief overview of Hanson's supply chain. In a nutshell, we quarry the rock and sand and limestone. We then turn it into cement which is transportable in pneumatic tankers. The rock and sand is transported in aggregate road tippers. In the case of Glebe Island, we'll be shifting that part goes to concrete plants
25 plants and aggregate depots and then it's delivered to our construction jobs through concrete trucks and as well to service the end products which are, you know bridges, roads schools, railways, airports and houses.

MS TUOR: Again, just a question on that, so your quarries – you might be about to
30 answer this but your quarries would be going to which ports? Is there one port that it's going to or a number?

MR DRIVER: So at Bass Point quarry we have – it's a coastal quarry so we have a ship loading facility and I'll provide you with a bit more information on that in the
35 following slides. The shipping route is from Bass Point, which is just immediately south of Shellharbour, if anyone knows where that is, and just north of Kiama. And it's about it's about a 110 kilometre sail up to Glebe Island. And on this slide here, which is that I've created, you've got Glebe Island here. The supply chain from Glebe Island to the Hanson concrete batch plants, we've got Pymont,
40 there's one at Artarmon, there's two at Brookvale, there's one at and Greenacre. So they will all consume aggregates out of Glebe Island. Not only that, we have commercial arrangements with Metromix, which is a concrete supplier as well in Alexandria, and also who supply asphalts.

45 So there's a picture of the Bass Point Quarry jetty. That currently exists and has been used historically as you can see on the next picture and then that would up to Glebe Island. Berth in Glebe Island One, transferred by conveyor to the

receiving hopper and then up to the silos for storage. The silos would then feed material into the batch plant, batching of concrete. They will also road tippers that will come underneath the silos and they will distribute those aggregates to our concrete plant network, that I just explained on the previous slide, and also to other construction sites, other customers in that area that I indicated

So the majority of materials consumed by the batch plant will be silos but importantly we have to point out that some aggregates will need to be delivered by road to the batch plant because these are raw materials and they're predominantly sand but there are also other specific government project requirements. These are sourced from landlocked quarries and can't come via a port. And also, I will note again that the Bass Point approval to ship logically requires a port destination close to market.

Just touching on some of the matters that you raised in the agenda in terms of built form, I think this photo montage is a good demonstration of what it looks like from you can see the Hanson – where's my pointer. You can see the Hanson facility sits in here, nestled in between the of the old Glebe Island Bridge and the multi-user. Although we're adjoining the multi-user, we're separated by a service road. Both sides are set back by about 10 metres from the edge of the wall and this will provide the potential for other access along the waterfront and obviously that's a matter for the likes of the port authority and the Department of Planning.

The Hanson facility is significantly smaller, looking at the multi-user, and existing but we've already touched on that. There is no operational commercial connection with the multi-user however the multi-user may be a potential source in the future. So this is another photo montage that I particularly like. It just shows what a working port looks like. And if you just look at that photo, the Hanson proposal for that facility does not look out of place. In terms of the visual impacts, we've been over this a little bit before. The proposal existing industrial waterfront area.

The shipping is an existing activity associated with Glebe Island. The residents would still maintain their expansive district views given the separation distance of the proposal and we would not impact on any views of Johnstons Bay or White Bay. The visual impacts are consistent with the impacts reasonably expected from a development in a port and and our proposal is to design materials that are consistent with the visual amenity and the industrial waterfront character of Glebe Island.

Just to touch on what a shipping container wall looks like – and I'll stick with maybe the pointer again. There's a good example. That's stacked probably twice as high as what we're proposing three containers high. That façade could be turned into a green wall or have a mural painted on it or some other treatment to make it visually acceptable. Obviously that will go through a public art strategy process that will involve lengthy consultation with the relevant stakeholders. I'm - - -

MS TUOR: Just before we get off visual impact, so just clarification. So as I understand it, the photo montages that we're looking at are of the earlier scheme because of the projecting roof and that they're not curved silos anymore. But just the accuracy of those photo montages, just clarification that they have been prepared in
5 accordance with – essentially certified that they're accurate – you know, that they've been based on survey information and wire frame so consistent with what the Land Environment Court have as their guidelines photo montage.

10 MR DRIVER: I might get Tim Ward to answer that question.

MS TUOR: Yes. Tim, are you there? Have we lost Tim?

MR T. WARD: Sorry, no, I'm here. I'm just - - -

15 MS TUOR: On mute.

MR WARD: I was muted and I've also minimised the screen somehow so I can't find it – there, I'm back. Sorry.

20 MS TUOR: Yes. We can see you now.

MR WARD: Yes. Look, the visual impact assessment doesn't specifically say that it was done in accordance with the court guidelines. That's something we would need to verify with AECOM who did that report.

25 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR WARD: I'm sure they would have done it in accordance with those guidelines or a very similar process but we will need to confirm that with you.

30 MS TUOR: Yes. I think what we need is some sort of certification as to their accuracy.

35 MR WARD: Yes.

MS TUOR: Yes. That would be good. And also I suppose – as I understand it, it did get smaller from what was previously proposed but how – I think it was length, wasn't it. But just whether there would be any difference in terms of what you're now proposing as to – like, what's in those photo montages, if they're accurate, is
40 that, sort of, essentially a worst case scenario and your amended proposal in the response to submissions made it a bit smaller.

MR WARD: Yes. Essentially that's what happened.

45 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR WARD: It did make it a little bit smaller. It pushed it a little bit further away but – at the scale that we’re talking about - - -

MS TUOR: It would be negligible.

5

MR WARD: - - - those changes aren’t going to significantly change what’s seen in the montage.

MS TUOR: Okay. Great. Thank you.

10

DR WILLIAMS: Annelise, sorry.

MS TUOR: Yes.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, could I just ask a question of Andrew please. Just in relation to the slides you’ve just finished showing us, Andrew, just about the design and materials – it might have been the previous slide – the – just explain why you decided to go with the straight wall silos for the aggregate silos rather than cylinders and also the materials that you’re proposing to use for those structures as well.

20

MR DRIVER: Yes. So it’s – anything curved is always difficult to build. Originally we were going to build the silos out of concrete and that would require and a form structure is very difficult to manufacture the for that. Then we moved to something square because then you can build it in panels and it up that way. But then if we do it in square then it also gives us the opportunity to make it out of – not concrete but other materials such as steel which significantly.

25

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thanks. Just on the next slide on with the containers and the – it’s a question I think I asked on site as well but – so these – the container wall that you’ve got, the six-storey – well, the six containers high but you’re proposing three, you would be quite open for – or agreeable for treatment of those containers similar to – in a sense, they become the green wall that you’re also talking about akin to your middle slide there.

30

35 MR DRIVER: Yes. This middle slide shows a green wall system that’s effectively put on as a façade.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

40 MR DRIVER: And it just hangs on to whatever wall that is existing so, you know – or a mural can be painted on the shipping containers. And you know, if you put it to the vote, some people like the maritime look of shipping containers, some people want a living green wall and some people would be more than happy with a mural. Don’t know until we start that process but happy to take on board whatever comes out of that consultation process.

45

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Because obviously anything for that would have to be – if that's the way it went, would have to be conditioned appropriately to ensure that those sorts of treatments were actually incorporated into the proposal. Yes.

5 MR DRIVER: I think the department have conditioned that adequately by requiring us to strategy.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Good. Thanks.

10 MR DRIVER:

MS TUOR: Just following on with that, as I understand it, the aggregate silos, now they're going to be straight and it's going to be, sort of, an infill-type structure, i.e. you'll have some sort of frame and then you will have panels of, you know,
15 potentially – you don't know what sort of material yet but it could be metal, that will fit into that frame. Is that - - -

MR DRIVER: Yes, correct. Whether it's steel or whether it's concrete, again, it can be painted. Either structure can have murals painted on it, whether it's, you
20 know, circle or round or whether they're square.

MS TUOR: Okay. And in terms of breaking up the bulk of the building, previously when it was the silo – the rounded silo similar to the other silos that are on the site, because of the curve you do get, you know, a degree of articulation, you get light
25 falling on it in different ways so that it's bulk gets broken up by the, sort of, nature of the shape. When it's a straight wall, as I understand it, it's roughly 34 metres high, but that's to the height of the ridge of the roof, but the straight wall is, you know, roughly 30 metres high, say, by 80 metres so it is quite a large straight structure.

30 So have you put your mind – and also the drawings that we've got are, I would say, very minimal, like, there's no dimensions, there's no RLs and – yes, they're quite minimal. So just – has there been any, sort of, architectural input into those drawings to look at, you know, how you could look at breaking up the overall bulk, i.e. like an expressed external structure with, sort of, different types of panels that you put in to
35 try and make it not such a monolithic form? Has there been any consideration of that?

MR DRIVER: No, not to that degree yet. Having said that, I will say that will say that we did provide, as part of the EIS package, elevations and sections but I don't
40 think that has been carried through to what has been produced as an appendix and that's okay. But again, similar to the shipping container walls, we're reasonably open to consider the form and how it can be treated to make sure that, from the public's perspective, it's acceptable outcome.

45 MS TUOR: So if you were to be looking at putting in an amended application, is it something that you would be open to also considering providing more information on just – particularly the silo, the aggregate silos because they're the large structure

but providing more, you know, architectural drawings as to just how they could be treated to break up the bulk through their structure as opposed to it just being something that gets thought about as a condition, you know, which potentially then limits it to being just some sort of applied thing, either paint or wrap or something as opposed to a physical expression of the building, if you understand what I mean.

MR DRIVER: I do. I'm – are you advising – are you suggesting that we go away and come up with a façade treatment on the silos and present that as amendment?

MS TUOR: Well, what I'm – this is just me thinking off the top of my head, is that you are now – put in a letter yesterday saying that you potentially will be seeking to amend the application. The IPC has to consider whether it approves your request to amend it, under section 55 of the regs, I think it is. And the department will have to undertake a further assessment of those amended plans and you will need to obviously speak to the department about the processes that have to be undertaken for that assessment.

So in that sense there is the opportunity to provide some further information that may be of assistance to the Commission in understanding just how the visual bulk of the proposal is – can be mitigated, given that it's one of the key issues that have been raised by objectors and also even your own visual impact assessment did have some conclusions about visual impact being, I think, moderate to significant. I can't remember the exact words. So yes, I think it's something that – just potentially if you can – don't have to answer now but if you just think about it as being something that could be of assistance to the Commission.

The other reason for it as well is that – I think you're also relying a bit on landscaping to soften the visual impacts of the proposal. But when you look at your site plan, you know, you try and look at where you could place landscaping. And if you look at, sort of, the northern boundary of the site, at the moment, on the current site plan, it has got traffic and parking along there. So there's no room to put any significant landscaping along that elevation. Similarly, the southern side, you know, between the building and the Glebe Island Bridge embankment, there's just no space to put any landscaping in that would be of any scale.

And also it's contaminated – as I understand, it's contaminated soil so you wouldn't necessarily be digging into it. You would be probably putting planter boxes. So to get landscaping of any significant scale would require space for structures and at the moment there is no space for structures. So that's from the north and south. And then again from the water you've got the containers but even those are hard up against your property boundary. So there's very limited opportunity to even put in just the planter boxes that you're – you know, if you wanted to achieve that sort of green wall.

So I think it's just us having confidence that if it's all left to a condition, i.e. condition that you put in a landscape plan, that that landscape plan isn't just going to show a few pot plants somewhere. If the purpose of the landscape plan is to actually

screen or soften the development then there has to be space for that to occur. So I think at the moment we've just got some concerns about it all being left to conditions and perhaps need a bit more certainty at this point in time.

5 MR DRIVER: Yes. I will go back to a point that was made by the department. It's an industrial report but there are a number of constraints to it. In terms of the northern boundary, we're adjacent to the multi-user which is a 20 metre high building. And you're correct, the opportunities for landscaping along there are definitely limited. But also to the benefit of that landscaping to the public or even to
10 the people occupying the tenancy in and amongst themselves, I'm not too sure whether there will be much benefit in that respect. And similar on the southern side, it's understood the points that you're making but that's part the constraints of an industrial working

15 I suppose the landscaping or softening of the visual impacts were put on – raised as an issue for people on the other side of the water, at Pyrmont, and that's why we're making a focal point on the shipping container wall and whether some form of landscaping can soften that impact. But it is what it is, for want of a better phrase. It's an industrial shipping port. I don't know too many ports around the world that
20 have a comprehensive and detailed landscape management plan. Working within the constraint, we're happy with whatever is reasonable and feasible, I guess, would be our position.

MS TUOR: Okay. So when we're assessing it we need to keep in mind then that
25 potentially a landscape plan would not provide any – other than the green wall along the containers, it wouldn't be any landscaping of substance and therefore it's really how the development reads as a built form. That's the assessment that we need to undertake. Is that correct?

30 MR WARD: Are you talking about the silos – the big silos?

MS TUOR: Well, the whole development but predominantly the big silos.

MR WARD: Yes.
35

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR WARD: I didn't think there was any – there was no proposals to try and screen
40 those silos in landscaping. I don't think that was ever going to be - - -

MR DRIVER: There's no potential for deep soil on - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

45 MR DRIVER: It's just – it will be planter boxes and things like that. We have no deep soil.

MS TUOR: Okay. It's just our understanding from the department's assessment report, to some extent, when you look at – I think they said that part of the mitigation measures that you put in were about – in terms of visual impact – were to be achieved through landscaping. And then the department, in its assessment to some
5 extent, relies on that landscaping as being something that will mitigate the visual impact. And I think we, as you are now saying, we were having concerns about the ability of landscaping to be one provided on site and therefore to – you know, its ability to achieve any of that softening effect and you know, the appropriateness of doing that as well.

10 But then – we then need to think about, I suppose, then the visual impact of the built form without any softening measures other than, you know, potentially some sort of wrap or painted thing unless there is some architectural articulation put into the building as well. That's what we're thinking at the moment. Anyway you don't
15 need to answer it now.

MR DRIVER: Yes.

MS TUOR: We're just letting you know, I suppose, what our preliminary thoughts
20 are.

MS JOSHUA: Can I also - - -

MR DRIVER: The other thing is – sorry.
25

MS TUOR: Yes, Casey.

MS JOSHUA: Sorry, I was just going to ask a question – given our understanding from the department is that landscaping and a landscape plan was envisaged as part
30 of the visual impact mitigation. What did you envisage when you put that in your documentation?

MR DRIVER: It was predominantly about the green wall. And it came out of our consultation with CLG, you know, the and at Pyrmont. They want to soften
35 up what the shipping containers would look like. Some people like the look of shipping containers because of, you know, it's the port and the maritime use. Some people want a mural painted over the shipping containers and then others said, "Why don't you turn it into a green wall" and green wall then that would be – that a landscape management plan because obviously it is a form of landscape.
40

MS TUOR: All right. Thank you. Peter, did you have any questions on that or we'll just move on to the next one?

DR WILLIAMS: I think, just to reiterate, that if you do proceed with the amended
45 plans this also could be an opportunity to just also deal with some of these other issues that have been raised as well at the same time, that's all. We just saw it as being an efficient way of – particularly a little bit more detail about articulation

and materials on the major component of the development which is the aggregate silos. We take the point that there's no opportunity to actually soften that part of the development so it does come down to trying to reasonably provide some sort of design or appearance to the structure to soften it a little bit.

5

The curvy linear, sort of, shapes might have assisted but I take your point why that's not feasible. Therefore we're thinking there might be some other basic design treatment that could be done on the exterior appearance just to break it up a little bit rather than an 80 metre long, 30 metre high blank wall through some articulation.

10 And particularly if you're using materials like steel, that might be a great opportunity to do that.

MR DRIVER: We've got the message. We'll take it away and we'll come back.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR DRIVER: Scott, do you have something that you want to offer at this point?

20 MR TIPPING: Yes. I was just going to say if it creates confusion in what's trying to be achieved right now, those suggestions in the letter yesterday – or amendments in the letter yesterday are very minor in terms of our operation. We would be very happy to retract that letter to minimise any complications through the assessment process.

25 MS TUOR: All right. Thank you. I think we had, in the interest of time, better quickly move on. So you were on to traffic, I think it was.

30 MR DRIVER: So the proposal will be remove 65,000 truck movements from the city road network per annum. The development is predicted to generally maintain the current level of serviceability across the three nearby intersections until the change and this will significantly improve traffic flow in and out of James Craig Road. Transport New South Wales RMS did not object to the traffic impact further information which was addressed in the RTS. And our concession in the RTS was to limit maximum hourly truck movements to 182 units. In terms of noise - - -

35

MS TUOR: Sorry, just before you move on from traffic, just so we understand it a bit better, the department's assessment, I think page 33, paragraph 6.5.5 – and we've asked this also of the department – it had a – sorry, 6.5.6, it said:

40 *During the a.m. peak, the intersections of The Crescent and both James Craig Road and Victoria Road would operate at an acceptable level of service under the cumulative impact scenario. However the level of service for The Crescent, City-West Link Road would deteriorate from level of service D to level of service F although the traffic impact assessment has modelled that a*
45 *deterioration to level of service F would occur regardless of this proposal. There would be a resultant 56 second delay from 96 seconds to 152 seconds.*

5 So can you just explain where that is and what's happening so that we have a bit more of an – we've also, as I said, asked the department about this but we're just trying to get a bit of understanding about where that is occurring and what the queueing of trucks etcetera would be and, I suppose, what Hanson's contribution to it is.

10 MR DRIVER: That would require a back to the traffic impact assessment. It's probably something that I can't address at this point in time but we can take that on notice and come back.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes. If you just want to take it on notice and even just point us to where it is assessed in the impact assessment.

15 MR WARD: I think just – what happened was the assessment identified those impacts and it was all – you know, the whole traffic network around that intersection changes once the M4-M5 Rozelle interchange comes on line. So that's why we made a commitment in the RTS to reduce the trucks until the WestConnex/Rozelle interchange is constructed to reduce the number of trucks so that there wasn't going to be that impact. So that was a level of impact that was caused by the full number of trucks and so the way we dealt with that was to reduce the number of trucks. I think we can probably respond to that – I think we have that response

20 MS TUOR: Yes. Because as I understand it the 286 movements, the operational peak, that occurs between 10 am and 12 pm so I don't know what the a.m. peak number of trucks was. Presumably it was less than the 286 movements. So yes, just explaining – and that's – the a.m. peak was the one that had the impact from going from D to F. So yes, if you could take it on notice and just get back to us with a bit more of an explanation, that would be good. All right. Noise.

30 MR DRIVER: In terms of noise, shore to ship power, we worked with the department Port Authority to try and address this issue. We investigated the shore to ship power noise but we were advised by shipping providers that none of the potential vessels need this type of power supply and doesn't currently exist on Glebe Island. Having said that, we are committed to sourcing a dedicated vessel for our proposal to ensure that the ship is minimised and all ship ships are not used on site.

40 Further on noise, we propose noise mitigation measures such as fully enclosing the batch plant, not partially, and including the conveyors. And as I said before, 7.83 wall. And the use of a dedicated ship to manage the noise. And there is also other minor but critical improvements such as putting air release silencers on trucks to enable – they release their brakes and get that loud squeal. There are devices that can arrest that.

45 We would also comply with the Port Authority's port noise policy as well as the existing EPAs noise policy for and furthermore, we would also conduct regular operational noise monitoring. Any question on noise before I move on to air?

MS TUOR: Not from me. Peter, have you got anything?

DR WILLIAMS: No but thanks for clarifying, Andrew, that issue of partially enclosed and fully enclosed. That was a point of uncertainty so that's quite clear
5 now. Thanks for that.

MR DRIVER: Moving on to air will basically be of plant and conveyor and the truck loading and unloading will be inside a building. The department, as you're probably well aware, commissioned Todoroski Air Sciences to conduct a the
10 matters raised by Todoroski have been adequately addressed in the RTS. Our commitment is that we will adopt an operational air quality management plan including dust monitoring. We will also conduct a air quality verification report and, as always, we will minimise dust, odour, vapour and gas emissions throughout our operations.

15 In terms of the community involvement, we've been involved with the Glebe Island and White Bay Community Liaison Group and we're obviously aware that there's a strategy that we need to participate in and make sure that whatever the ultimate treatment is on the our proposal is acceptable and that becomes – softens the
20 impact of that industrial look and becomes something that's acceptable to the broader community. There's an example of but if you can up in here, Annelise – I'll get the pointer – you do need that structure for the conveyors, silos. Instead of putting something like that straight on top of a circular cylinder, we propose to that with a gable roof just to provide some articulation and some point of difference but

25 MS TUOR: Okay.

MR DRIVER: You also asked questions about the department's report and Hanson's responses so I will just go through that. Operating hours – I've said it
30 before but 24/7 is crucial for modern day construction jobs. And it's also consistent with the multi-user which is already approved to operate 24/7. That's a very important point in terms of equity employment, yes, there are 90 construction jobs and 67 ongoing operational jobs that will be generated from this proposal. The timing, the department had in their report six to nine months. It is more likely to take
35 18 to 24 months, with operations commencing in 2024.

In terms of our concessions and amendments during the response submissions, we reduced the footprint. We relocated the noise generating activities further away from the closest and adopted further measures to mitigate noise impacts. And we also
40 limited the maximum hourly truck movements to 182.

MS TUOR: Just clarifying, when is the M4-M5 opening and how does that go with your construction because you – that's around about 2024 as well, isn't it.

45 MR DRIVER: Correct.

MS TUOR: So in that sense it would – your facility would open potentially when that's constructed. So the limitation on 182 perhaps would never happen in the sense that you would be seeking an increase once that opens presumably.

5 MR DRIVER: Potentially but then that's so depends on

MS TUOR: Okay.

10 MR DRIVER: Duration of use, I think this is an important one. Hanson agrees with the position the department took. The department considered the proposal be and that's acceptable and shouldn't have a condition that limits because it can be controlled through leasing arrangements with the Port Authority of New South Wales and it's consistent with the working with other strategic plans. While the department appreciates the long-term vision opportunities for there still
15 remains a strong by government that the existing use of – now a working harbour.

And they came to the conclusion that the proposal impacts are considered acceptable and allow for the potential uses to co-exist within so we generally agree with
20 those findings. In terms of construction noise - - -

MS TUOR: Sorry, just on that duration of use – so that's the department's conclusion about it being able to co-exist within the future, you know, uses in the precinct and that there isn't the need for consent. And it would be controlled by
25 the lease arrangement if it were decided that the facility needed to move or change etcetera, etcetera. I mean, at the moment we're still working our way through all this strategic framework, in particular the most recent plan that was on exhibition which seems to identify this area as having an ongoing use with having to have, you know, sort of, public access at a raised level. So we're just trying to understand how things
30 would be able to co-exist in the future. So perhaps – if the Commission were of a mind to impose some sort of time-limited consent on the operation, so to enable that, you know, 20 years from now etcetera, there could be further consideration once more of this urban framework was known and changes occurred in the surrounding area. Just, you know, what is your opinion about that in terms of what sort of time
35 period would be – I know it's not something you support but just to further comment on it.

MR DRIVER: I will just point out that the consent runs with the land so while Hanson is the applicant and the whether Hanson's stays on the site or is removed
40 through whatever the commercial arrangements with the Port Authority. It – the consent belongs with the land. So I don't think limiting the consent would see it as the absolute controlling mechanism for operating the plant. That arrangement can be built with those arrangements with the Port Authority.

45 MS TUOR: Okay. Peter, did you have any question on that? No. Okay. All right. Construction noise.

MR DRIVER: So construction noise, the department recommended a number of construction noise management vibration plans as we agree with that. It's a sensible outcome. And there's a whole other bunch of plans that the department have recommended and we agree with them. They're part and parcel of modern day major project it's not unusual so, yes, take those as read.

MS TUOR: Okay. So that's your presentation or have you still got more to go?

MR DRIVER: There's a whole – yes.

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR DRIVER: That's pretty much it.

MS TUOR: Okay. So just one thing that you haven't really covered is about the current capacity of your – the facility that you had that has been demolished and also the Hymix one so did you have any information on just what the output from those was? And also just to comment on the future of the Hymix one.

MR DRIVER: Just to be clear, and I don't know – we have a lot of discussions with the Department of Planning but the conclusion that Glebe Island, you know, is a replacement for our Blackwattle Bay operations, I don't think that's correct to say. And it is also not a replacement for the Pymont operations which is – you know, one's under a separate brand. If you're specifically chasing those capacities to come up with some alignment on Glebe Island, we can provide that. However I think slides that the cubic metres around it was based on the broader Sydney CBD and surrounding areas market which we're looking to capture and rationalise.

MS TUOR: Okay. So in terms of the need for the facility, the replacement of the Glebe Island and the Hymix is not – that's not the basis for it. There's enough demand for the facility in its own right plus Hymix staying. Is that what you're saying?

MR DRIVER: I mean, I'll get back to – we have a down at Bass Point Quarry which has the approval to ship aggregates out of that quarry. It makes commercial sense for us to be doing that. It also makes a sustainable environmental benefit to take those trucks off the road. So if we're going to ship aggregates to Glebe Island and then redistribute it back to Blackwattle Bay, if that was still in existence, to me that logically doesn't make sense. It makes sense to actually batch the concrete at Glebe Island.

MS TUOR: Okay. And one other question I had, just in terms of the silos again, if you can just – if you know roughly what one metre of height equates to in volumetric capacity. So if the silos were 31 metres instead of 30 metres, how much capacity does that increase it by or conversely if they were reduced, what does it decrease the capacity by.

MR DRIVER: I will take that one on notice.

MS TUOR: Yes. Okay. I think they were the questions I had. Peter, anything that we've missed out?

5

DR WILLIAMS: Just one simple question, sorry, Andrew. I appreciate the significance of having so much of the movement done by ship rather than by truck but there will still need to be some truck movements of sand and I think you said also some aggregate by truck onto the site. Will those trucks leave empty or will they be taking some materials away from the site once they've unloaded?

10

MR DRIVER: It wouldn't be sustainable or efficient for us to send an empty truck out of the site - - -

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR DRIVER: - - - taking some of the aggregates out of the depot. So while they might be bringing in sand from another source, they will definitely be leaving loaded and carrying that aggregate to one of the other facilities within that catchment area that I pointed to earlier.

20

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. All right. That's good. Thanks Andrew.

MR DRIVER: Yes. They're that we're chasing and that's the – it's also a sustainability to us too.

25

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes. Thank you.

MS TUOR: So optimally the trucks will be coming in laden with something and they will be leaving laden with something. So they 182 trucks, half of them come in with something and half of them go out with something. Is that right?

30

MR DRIVER: Unless it's a concrete truck. A concrete truck can't come back.

35 MS TUOR: Yes, sure.

MR TIPPING: And there might be other times where a truck needs to leave site empty for servicing, driver requirements, other things as well.

40 MS TUOR: Yes. Yes. But optimally that's what you would be trying to achieve.

MR TIPPING: Correct.

MS TUOR: And just – I don't know if you've got this but roughly the amount of material that's delivered by ship compared to the amount that's delivered by truck. Is there a percentage that you would - - -

45

MR DRIVER: Rough, rough, don't quote me on this, but I would expect it would probably be in the order of 10 per cent. Scott, you might - - -

5 MR TIPPING: We might come back to you on that one. It depends on a range of factors around the concrete mix and what has been pulled through at any point in time.

MS TUOR: Okay.

10 MR DRIVER: But the largest percentage is certainly the coarse aggregates that would be getting shipped – shipped in.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes. If you just provide some figures, that would be good. All right. Well, I think that was all my questions. Unless anyone else has any questions?
15 Casey or Peter or – no.

MR J. ARDAS: Look, I have a question which is - - -

MS TUOR: Yes. Sorry, Julian.
20

MR ARDAS: Yes. It just stems on from the other aggregates, like the sand, you've been very clear that your latite and your aggregates are coming from Bass Point. It's not very clear as to where the sand is coming from. I haven't really been able to get a real understanding of what kind of volumes and truck movements of sand coming
25 into the facility. So perhaps if you could – you know, you could take this on notice if you like but if you could direct us to where that is in the documentation or embellish that information to just give us an understanding, that would be really good because you've been really good in terms of saying that every truck will be laden which is great.

30 So that, sort of – it's all about loads and making full use of that for lots of reasons, commercial and sustainable and so on. But we just don't really have a strong appreciation of the sand, and the sand supply, and sand movements and sand volumes into the facility so if you could clarify that please, it would be greatly
35 appreciated.

MS TUOR: I suppose the only other thing we need to briefly touch on is just your letter of yesterday, if there's anything that you want to explain further in that as to what you're seeking. And I think also just whether you're still seeking to do it or
40 not.

MR DRIVER: The purpose of the letter was to articulate that by shifting the the silo structure and the batch building, it straightens out the alignment of the conveyors which makes a lot of sense from not only – you know, we've side of things but
45 transferring the proper materials at those transfer points. And - - -

MS TUOR: And why does it mean that the aggregate storage silos have to be moved back to the southern boundary? Why - - -

5 MR DRIVER: So to convey the material to the batch plant, we need a bit more of a separation distance there because I think we've still got the parking located in there. We would need the building a little bit to the south and therefore the silos have to, sort of, be more

10 MS TUOR: Sorry, what was that? I missed the last bit.

MR DRIVER: The silo building has to be with that movement of the batch building.

15 MS TUOR: And it eliminated that truck exit area there and that parking along there. Is that right?

20 MR DRIVER: There's a lot of cars there – not so much eliminates it but it puts it under cover. So in terms of noise and any other emissions, that's quite a underneath the silo structure as opposed to being open between the silo structure and the bridge abutment.

25 MS TUOR: Okay. Any other questions on that? No. Okay. I think that's it so thank you very, very much for your presentation. It was very helpful. See you at the public meeting.

MR DRIVER: We've got a number of questions and we will endeavour to get back to you as soon as possible on those.

30 MS TUOR: Okay. Yes. So if you could get back to us within the week, that would be good.

MR DRIVER: Thanks for your time today.

35 MS TUOR: Thank you.

MS JOSHUA: Sorry, can I just jump in and quickly ask, based on the conversation today, what would the status be of those amendments? Are you going to pursue those?

40 MS TUOR: Do you want to take it on notice and just confirm with Casey?

45 MR DRIVER: Yes. What we don't want is to – time is of the essence so what we don't want is to delay the process unnecessarily. And if it's within the to be able to approve a minor amendment like this, then that will be our preferred course of action. If it means that you acquire more information to demonstrate that the are within the current impact envelope or actually improve the impacts, then we're happy to go down that path. But we don't want to go back to planning and undergo a

whole system on what we believe is a minor amendment which is not only to the benefit of the buildability but also the impacts on

5 MS TUOR: Well you probably would need to have discussions with the department
but my understanding is that the nature of the amendment would – the IPC doesn't
assess applications so the nature of the amendment would mean that it would need to
go back to the department and they would look at it and write a, sort of,
supplementary assessment of it. But the timing on that etcetera is something you
would need to talk to the department about as to how long it will take. But maybe
10 have some discussions with Casey offline on this if you – once you've had a think
about it.

MR DRIVER: Thank you for that.

15 MS TUOR: But again, that needs to be resolved as quickly as possible so if you
could get back to Casey, you know, tomorrow morning, that would be good.

MR DRIVER: Okay.

20 MS TUOR: All right.

MR DRIVER: We will provide a copy of this presentation too.

MS TUOR: Yes, that would be great. All right. Thank you very much.
25

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks everyone.

MR WARD: Thank you all. Have a great day.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Thanks a lot. Thank you.

MATTER ADJOURNED at 12.16 pm INDEFINITELY