



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-1461595

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

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

CITY OF SYDNEY COUNCIL MEETING

SSD 8544

IPC PANEL:

ANNELISE TUOR (Chair)

DR PETER WILLIAMS

OFFICE OF THE IPC:

CASEY JOSHUA

JULIAN ARDAS

CITY OF SYDNEY COUNCIL:

ANDREW REES

MARIE BURGE

SYDNEY

2.30 PM, THURSDAY, 6 MAY 2021

MS A. TUOR: All right. Well, thank you for joining us. 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 their elders, past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss SSD8544 for the proposed Glebe Island Concrete
5 Batching Plant and Aggregate Handling Facility Project, currently before the Commission for determination.

The applicant, Hanson Construction Materials Proprietary Limited is seeking approval for an aggregate handling facility and concrete batching plant at Glebe
10 Island. The project would have the capacity to produce up to 1 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 by my fellow commissioner, Dr Peter Williams. We also are joined by Casey Joshua from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission and Julian Ardas who is assisting
15 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. This meeting is part of –
20 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
25 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
30 that they do not speak over the top of others. So if we just start with introduction from the council attendees.

MS M. BURGE: Hi, everyone.

35 MS TUOR: Yes.

MS BURGE: My name is Marie Burge and I'm a specialist planner at the City of Sydney.

40 MS TUOR: Hi.

MR A. REES: And I'm Andrew Rees. I'm the area planning manager for the City of Sydney.

MS TUOR: Okay. Thanks. So you've been sent an agenda. So we will just follow that format. So the first part of it was just if you've got any feedback or response to the Department's assessment report and their recommended conditions.

5 MS BURGE: I - - -

MS TUOR: So can respond to that?

MR REES: Yes. Certainly.

10

MS BURGE: I have a general comment on one of the conditions that was proposed. We've noticed that condition B21 refers to an outdated City of Sydney Waste Policy when referring to the storage and handling of waste. We questioned why the City of Sydney policy is being recommended when the site falls outside the City of Sydney Council area. If it was on purpose that you referring to the City of Sydney Waste Policy and it was intentional, we would recommend that the condition reflect the current waste policy that we use, which is the Guidelines for Waste Management in New Developments 2018. We do have some other comments on general conditions of consent if you would like and, if I - - -

15

MS TUOR: Yes, yes. If you want to just go through those.

MS BURGE: Yes.

20 MS TUOR: That would be great.

MS BURGE: Yes. No worries. In terms of traffic impacts and cycling networks, we note that one of the objectives for the Port and Employment Zone of SREP 26 is for the development to provide pedestrian and cyclists links with – sort of rounding the public domain access networks and, although the department is satisfied the development meets other objectives in the zone, noting that the development won't impact the future reopening of the Glebe Island Bridge and the access to the site is restricted by a Customs secure area secure zone, we believe that the development should address and improve cycling routes further surrounding the site.

30

The condition – the proposed travel plan requirements in condition E20 that the department has included – requires a basic response to pedestrian and bicycle linkages to the site. However, we recommend that the consent also address the broader pedestrian and cycleway impacts of the development by way of additional public domain work, such as a provision of dedicated cycleways or line marking along James Craig Road and Sommerville Road to maintain the cycleway access to cyclists and provide a basis for future cycleway linkages through the Bays Precinct and we think that the travel plan should be prepared in consultation with Inner West Council and in accordance with their public domain standards.

35

It's well known that James Craig Road and Sommerville Road are frequently used by cyclists accessing ANZAC Bridge and we feel that their proposed development is

likely to have a great impact on movements on roads surrounding the site. So, although the condition to prepare a construction traffic management plan is suitable to provide a response to managing traffic and cycle movements throughout the construction phase, we feel that a more in-depth condition should be added to the consent that manages long-term traffic impacts.

In terms of public art, as well, we noted that in our previous submission that the proponent should address public art as part of the proposal rather than being an afterthought that is designed into the development post-consent. We note that it hasn't been done, but we trust that Hanson will take this opportunity to commission an art work that responds appropriately to the historic context of the site while adding value to the skyline.

We are concerned, however, that the condition proposed – I'm not sure of the exact number of the condition for public art that the department has recommended isn't clear enough in restricting any opportunity for signage and advertising on the site, particularly being on the silos as they're very close to ANZAC Bridge. We made it clear in our submission that the visual impacts of the development are quite great and cause destructive views across the harbour and to significant historic landmarks, including the ANZAC Bridge and Glebe Island Bridge from any vantage points within the public domain.

So we believe that the most suitable compromise to mitigate some of these impacts, aside from relocating the development further away from significant landmarks, as we've suggested in a previous submission, is to integrate public art and landscaping, will be provided examples of similar silo artworks within Australia that have been completed by artists, including Guido van Helton and Fintan Magee, that could guide the applicant when considering the public art approach to the development. We just wanted to make it clear that in no situation we will be supportive of any kind of signage or advertising being incorporated into the public art strategy for the silos and we would recommend that either a new condition of consent be imposed that prohibits any advertising or signage on the silos or that the condition relating to public art be amended to clearly state that the artworks must not incorporate signage or advertising of any kind.

MS TUOR: Okay. I think condition A(6) says this consent does not approve signage.

MS BURGE: Yes.

MS TUOR: But it doesn't actually say, as you're pointing out, that there's to be no signage.

MS BURGE: Correct.

MS TUOR: I think you're wanting it to go further to say that it's not approving the signage, but that there shouldn't be any signage.

MS BURGE: Correct.

MS TUOR: Okay. That's as I understand what I you're saying. All right. Yes.

5 MR REES: Okay. So I will just talk about noise and amelioration.

MS TUOR: Sure.

10 MR REES: As you would have noted, the City of Sydney's submission to the Department of Planning and Industry and Environment did not raise objection to the proposal from a noise impact and mitigation perspective. This was primarily because the majority of activities are to be conducted within an enclosed building. On closer inspection, however, in preparation for this hearing, I would like to note the details of the noise attenuation of the enclosure are noticeably lacking. Perhaps the only
15 information disclosed is at section 3.1.2 of the applicant's EIS which states:

The enclosed building will be constructed in steel frame with Colorbond walls and roof.

20 So is it reasonable to conclude the enclosed building will not be acoustically treated? There is certainly no assessment in the applicant's acoustic report as to how the Colorbond walls and roof will contain the noise from the operation of the batching plant with or without insulation.

25 Section 3.1.2 of the applicant's EIS goes onto say high-speed roller doors will be installed on the east and west side of the building to allow for vehicular access through the building during the batching process or for delivery of cement by truck. Two doors will be located on the west of the building and six doors will be located on the east of the building. The doors – the roller doors will be closed when not
30 needed for access. Is this enclosure of the roller doors when not needed for accessed a condition of access? It does not appear to be nor is it addressed in the acoustic report.

35 In regards to air quality, I note the EPA submission notes the – that the 1st of January 2020 has been set as a global implementation date under MARPOL for a significant reduction in sulphur content of the fuel oil used by ships from 3.5 per cent to .5 per cent. There seems to be no discussion on this important aspect of the proposal in the DPIE assessment report. The only mention about the berthing vessel is the applicant is committed to sourcing a dedicated vessel for the proposal to ensure noise from the
40 ship berthing is minimised and poor noise performing ships are not to be used at the site. What fuel the boat or boats will be – will use is notably silent, both in the department's assessment report and the draft consent conditions. This is also – this also includes the department's independent peer review of air quality authored by Todoroski Air Sciences.

45

I would also like to talk about the long-term plan for the area and how this concrete batching and aggregate handling facility will remain harmonious with the inevitable

changes that are to occur on Glebe Island. The long-term plans are outlined under the recently exhibited Bays West Place Strategy. One of the five big moves is to make the most of the opportunity that a new metro station presents to renew the precinct and surrounds through development which has a strong dependence on public and active transport. The Bays West Structure Plan 2040 and beyond diagrammatically illustrates the long-term plan for Glebe island with development zone with greater height potential to lay adjacent to the multi-user facility.

One can only look to the examples of other over-station developments associated with the new Sydney Metro City and South-West and conclude that this will result in as many apartments that can be squeezed in under the obstacle limitation surface for Sydney's Kingsford Smith Airport and what building separate will be considered acceptable by the State Government. The proximity of sensitive land uses will only further encroach onto this use should it be approved.

Having high-density apartments right adjacent to a heavy industrial activity sounds like trouble brewing and an issue that requires thorough, careful consideration. In our EIS submission, we did note that further preventative and mitigation measures should be considered to reduce impacts to sensitive receivers, including the provision of sufficient onshore infrastructure such as an appropriate electricity supply to enable berthed boats to connect to an onshore supply and turn off their engines. We note that the DPIE assessment report at section 6.4.13 states:

The applicant investigated the use of shore-to-ship power for reducing ship noise, but noted that none of the potential vessels can connect to this type of power of supply making it unviable.

And, with that and the way the consent is drafted, the operator has no legal obligation to review the viability of shore-to-ship power ever again. Furthermore, who objectively reviewed the applicant's claim about the viability of providing vessels to connect to a power supply? The documentation made available seems to reveal next to nothing about this consideration.

The City of Sydney has been in recent consultation with the Australian Navy at HMAS Kuttabul, formerly referred to as Garden Island, at Woolloomooloo and the stage 2 Garden Island Critical Infrastructure Recovery Program. A recent site visit reveals that work has been carried out to make all ships that berth at this military base connect to power – to an electrical source of power. This will mean no ships will be burning fuel whilst docked spreading plumes of carcinogenic particulates into the atmosphere and upon the residents of Potts Point and Woolloomooloo. The works are to be completed in late 2023 and will result in a significant improvement to their operational impacts from an air quality and noise emission perspective.

Ideally, the concrete batching plant and aggregate handling facility at this site should have a time-limited consent similar to condition A8 of the approval for the maritime facility at number 5 Bank Street, Pyrmont, consent reference MP11_0001. The condition states:

The operation of this approval from the commencement of the operation of this use is restricted to a maximum of five years.

5 The driver for this time-limited consent is that this site is also located in the Bays
Precinct where more intense redevelopment is planned for the future. In the absence
of a time-limited consent for this site, there really needs to be a condition that the
proponent shall provide ship-to-shore power beyond five years of the date of
commencement of use. At the very least, the commitment to use ships with low
sulphur fuel should be a priority whilst the viability of short-to-ship power becomes a
10 reality.

Under the EIS, section 3.4, Duration of Consent, notes:

15 *The site and its surrounding area is in a state of flux and the character of the
surrounding area will change as the New South Wales Government redevelops
the Bays Precinct over the next 10 to 15 years. The design and operation of the
proposed development has been prepared with this changing context in mind.
It is anticipated that the facility would be modified in future to allow the
operations to coexist with future land uses in the surrounding area as they are
20 determined and delivered.*

What “modified in the future” would constitute and how it would be done is not
disclosed or elaborated upon. The EIS goes on to say:

25 *As the site is owned by the New South Wales Government, who are also
responsible for overseeing and redelivering the redevelopment of the Bays
Precinct, it is anticipated that the tenure of Hanson operation on the site can be
controlled via the leasing arrangements that will be in place between Hanson
and the Ports Authority of New South Wales.*

30 How confident can we be to rely upon Hanson and the Ports Authority of New South
Wales to objectively review their operation and the viability of using better
performing ships or shore-to-ship power? What legal obligations are in place?
Again, I reiterate, in the absence of a time-limited consent for this site, there really
35 needs to be a condition that the use beyond five years of commencement shall
provide ship-to-shore power, at the very least the commitment to use ships with low
sulphur fuel should be a priority whilst the viability of short-to-ship power becomes a
reality.

40 And that’s my formal response.

MS TUOR: All right. So, just stepping back a bit, I presume that your comments in
your original submission on the EIS still stand that, essentially, there’s a degree of
opposition to the proposal, but the comments that you’ve made now are essentially
45 efforts to be approved and these are the sorts of things that need to be addressed; is
that correct?

MR REES: That's correct. Yes.

MS TUOR: Okay. I might just see if the others have some questions while I just quickly look over my notes. So any questions from anyone else? Peter.

5

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Sorry. Thanks, Annelise. Yes, Andrew and Marie, I just want to clarify that question that Annelise just posed. In the department's assessment report it appears that Sydney City Council has no objection to the – to this proposal, though it has got some concerns and issues. So is that – is it fair to say 10 it is an objection or it is – or no objection, but with concerns and issues along the lines that you've - - -

MR REES: The latter, Peter. Yes.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR REES: So no objection and we understand that this is a – you know, an integral part of the jigsaw puzzle of the Bays Precinct that's, you know, related to the delivery of the Sydney Fish Markets and, obviously, having a concrete batching plant 20 in close proximity to the CBD is something that is needed to be done. However, I think there needs to be further work, like we said, to ensure that, moving forward, as this area becomes more intensely developed, that it works harmoniously with the high-density apartments that will be surrounding it in the future.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Yes. Good. No. That's – that clarifies it greatly. That's good. Thank you.

MS TUOR: And I think one of your comments on the original proposal or a suggestion was about it being moved – that the proposal should be moved. Can you 30 just explain what that was and what – whether you still are pursuing that?

MR REES: No. I guess – I mean, that was one suggestion is perhaps to move it further north, slightly adjust it so it's further to the north. I guess that might mean it's closer to the residents of Balmain. So – but, in the absence of any other 35 alternatives around the harbour, I guess, you know, we just need to look at how to ameliorate this – the impacts of the heavy industrial use.

MS TUOR: Okay.

40 MR REES: There was one other thing about lighting. There was – there are two conditions, actually, that deal with the same thing, condition B6 and condition F22. So they both cite the Australian Standard AS 4282-1997. One of the conditions, however, does cite the ACON's lighting strategy. In our submission, we ask that all lighting be fitted with dimmers to allow areas to be dimmed or lights switched off 45 when not in use and our review of that seven-page ACON report is that such measures are not discussed or mandated. So, with that, I don't think there will be any opportunity to enforce any dimming or lights to be switched off when not in use.

MS TUOR: Okay.

MR REES: Also condition F18, Dust Management, does talk about:

5 *All reasonable and feasible best practice measures are to be implemented –*

but we don't know who would agree or define what the "best practice" is for that condition. It's just simply worded as "all reasonable and feasible best practice measures are implemented".

10

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, Andrew. What condition was that again? Sorry about that.

MR REES: F18, Dust Management.

15 DR WILLIAMS: F18.

MR REES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thanks.

20

MS TUOR: Okay. So your specific comments on the conditions, would you be able to put that in writing? I mean, we've all taken notes, but just it would be good if you actually had it clearly articulated - - -

25 MR REES: to Casey.

MS TUOR: - - - in writing. And, yes, and forward to Casey as soon as you can, you know, within a week, if that – if you can do that.

30 MR REES: Sure. Yes. And, while I was just looking at my notes, too, I think condition F5 is talking about:

35 *The applicant must source a dedicated vessel to supply raw material to the facility to ensure noise from ship berthing is minimised and poor performing ships are not used at the site.*

I think there's maybe a few words that need to be inserted in there to – so I will put that in writing in as well.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Sure.

MS TUOR: Yes, yes.

MR REES:

45

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR REES: Yes. Some of the words - - -

MS TUOR: Yes. I mean, if you want to have a closer look at the conditions and anything that you – even if you haven't mentioned it today, but, if you want to - - -

5

MR REES: Okay. All right.

MS TUOR: - - - and just include it. That would be helpful.

10 MR REES: And, perhaps, yes, I think, you know, the green wall is tied in the public art strategy, but it's not actually linked to the landscape plan under C40. So we will mention that as well.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

15

MS TUOR: Yep.

MR REES:

20 MS TUOR: All right.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR REES: Yes.

25

DR WILLIAMS: Any particular views on the green wall as it stands, as you can see it operating at the moment?

MR REES: Operating - - -

30

DR WILLIAMS: Well, as proposed at the moment, sorry, I should say.

MR REES: Well, any greenery around the perimeter would be of some benefit. I guess, we will need – the devil is in the detail. So we will need to see that – how that works. You know, it is on a pretty exposed area - - -

35

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR REES: - - - particularly in – there's a blowing. So, yes. So we will need to be mindful of those sorts of microclimatic conditions to ensure that it's going to not turn into a brown or dead wall rather than a green one.

40

MS TUOR: So your opinion is that there is some utility in having a degree of landscaping around the site. There has been counter-arguments put that it's an industrial site and landscaping historically is not something that you have co-existing with industrial sites and the feasibility of achieving it is fairly limited. So do you have any comments on that?

45

MS BURGE: Our original comments upon review of the submitted plans, the plans were annotated showing green wall and so really we sought clarification as to what green was, if it actually meant landscaping or if it was painted green, we feel that there is always benefit in landscaping around the site to increase canopy coverage in a dense urban area. The limited information that was provided throughout the assessment of the application though makes it difficult to provide any further advice than we would be supportive of landscaping. I believe that the provision of landscaping on site will have less of a benefit in terms of mitigating visual impacts from certain areas because of the distance from vantage points at the ground level and we feel that public art would probably achieve a better outcome in terms of mitigating visual impacts, but, of course, landscape works are always welcome.

MS TUOR: And the public art you're looking for is essentially something that's, you know, applied to the silos, in particular? Is that the sort of thing – or are you also looking for, sort of, architectural treatment of the buildings themselves to achieve a degree of articulation?

MS BURGE: It would be difficult to recommend a certain finish. Of course, our suggestions that we've provided have been paint finishes and art finishes to the silos, but we would be open for a discussion on how that is addressed.

MS TUOR: And is your understanding of the silos that they're now – essentially, it's a flat surface, as I understand it, as opposed to the curved surface that was in the photo montages earlier on?

MS BURGE: I'm not sure. I'm not sure of the exact finish of it.

MS TUOR: Or just the shape. Yes.

MR REES: Yes.

MS BURGE: Yes.

MR REES: But certainly with the rounded shape. I mean, you look at Fintan McGee's work. It has been applied to a cylindrical silo. So it is possible. It's a flat surface. It's just on a curve. So - - -

MS TUOR: Yes. And my understanding is that the current proposal in the plans that are listed in - - -

MR REES: It is showing the flat.

MS TUOR: It's a flat surface in – and I think her operation and construction, etcetera, that's a easier thing to be achieved than the curved one.

MR REES: Yes. Well, that's even better then.

MS TUOR: A flat surface is better Okay.

MR REES: I'm no – I'm not an artist, by any stretch of the imagination, but I would imagine it would be easier for an artist to apply to a flat surface.

5

MS TUOR: Sure. All right. Anything other questions from anyone?

DR WILLIAMS:

10 MS TUOR: No.

MR REES: No. That's all. Thank you very much.

MS TUOR: Okay. Thank you very much.

15

MR REES: All right. Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Andrew. Thank you, Marie. Thank you.

20 MR REES: Bye, bye.

MS JOSHUA: Thank you very much.

MR REES: Bye.

25

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

ADJOURNED

[2.57 pm]