



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-1462362

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

**RE: GLEBE ISLAND CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT AND AGGREGATE
HANDLING FACILITY**

PANEL:

**ANNELISE TUOR (CHAIR)
DR PETER WILLIAMS**

LOCATION:

VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE:

9.00 AM, MONDAY, 17 MAY 2021

MS A. TUOR: Good morning and welcome to the Independent Planning Commission's electronic public meeting for state significant development application SSD 8544 which replaces the Glebe Island concrete batching plant and aggregate handling facility. My name is Annelise Tuor and I'm the chair of the
5 Independent Planning Commission panel. Joining me is my fellow commissioner, Dr Peter Williams. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we variously meet and pay my respects to the elders past, present and emerging. The applicant, Hanson Construction Materials Proprietary Limited, is seeking approval for an aggregate handling facility and
10 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. In its assessment report, the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, or DPIE,
15 has concluded that the application is approvable subject to conditions. The Minister for Planning and Public Spaces has asked the Commission to determine this application within eight weeks of receiving the final whole of government assessment report from DPIE. In response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission currently holds public meetings online, with registered speakers
20 provided the opportunity to present to the panel via telephone and video conference.

In the interests of openness and transparency, we are live streaming proceedings on the Commission's website, and a full transcript of today's meeting will be published in the next few days. With regards to the Commission's role in determining –
25 determination of this project, the Commission was established by the New South Wales Government on 1 March 2018 as a standalone statutory body, operating independently of DPIE and other government agencies. The Commission plays an important role in strengthening the transparency and independence of the – in the decision-making process for major development and land use planning in New South
30 Wales.

The Commission is the consent authority for this SSD application because the Inner West Council objected to the proposal and because there were more than 50 unique submissions objecting to the proposal we received. It's important to note that the
35 Commission is not involved in the Department's assessment of the SSD application, nor in the preparation of assessment reports. Commissioners make an annual declaration of interest identifying potential conflicts with their appointed role. You can find additional information on the way we manage potential conflicts of interest on our website. A conflicts register for this project has been published on the
40 Commission's project website.

In terms of where we are in the process, this public meeting forms one part of the Commission's process. We have also undertaken a site inspection and met with DPIE, the applicant, the Inner West Council, the City of Sydney Council and the
45 New South Wales Port Authority. Transcripts of all these meetings and the site inspection notes have been published on our website. After the public meeting, we

may convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is required and matters raised. Following the public meeting, we endeavour to determine the development application as soon as possible, noting that there may be a delay if we find that additional information is needed.

5

Written submissions on this matter will be accepted by the Commission up to 5 pm next Monday, 24 May 2021, and you can make a submission using the Have Your Say portal on our website, or by email or post. The purpose of this meeting is to invite interested individuals and groups to make any submission they consider appropriate regarding this SSD application. However, the Commission is particularly assisted by submissions that are responsive to DPIEs assessment report and its recommended conditions of consent. All submissions made to the Department during exhibition of the applicant's environmental impact statement have been made available to the Commission.

15

As such, today's speakers are encouraged to avoid just repeating or restating their submissions that they have previously made to this application. Before we get underway, I would like to outline how today's public meeting will run. We will first hear from DPIE on the findings of its whole of government assessment of the SSD application currently before the Commission. We will then hear from the applicant, and then proceed to hear from our registered speakers. The Commission members may ask questions of the speakers so that we can further – better understand what you're saying. While we will endeavour to stick to our published schedule, this will be dependent on registered speakers being ready to present at their allocated time.

25

I will introduce each speaker when it's their turn to present to the panel. Everyone has been advised in advance how long they have to speak. A bell will sound when a speaker has one minute remaining. A second bell will sound when the speaker's time has expired. To ensure that everyone receives their fair share of time, I will enforce time-keeping rules. I do, however, reserve the right to allow additional time as required to hear new information. If you would like to provide a copy of your presentation or speaking notes to support your presentation, please email it to the Commission, and please note that any information given to us will be made public. The Commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing all the information, and our privacy statement is available on our website. So thank you, and we will now begin. I will call the first speaker. So it's Ms Anthea Sargeant, who is the Executive Director, Compliance Industry and Key Sites at the Department of Industry – Planning, Industry and Environment.

40 MS A. SARGEANT: Good morning. Is my audio okay?

MS A. TUOR: Yes.

MS SARGEANT: Yes, it's fine.

45

MS TUOR: Okay. Great. So good morning, everyone. My name is Anthea Sargeant. I am an executive director at the Department of Planning, Industry and

Environment, and I'm here today with two of my colleagues, Cameron Sargent and Karl Fetterplace. The Commission has invited us to present at today's public meeting and I will begin with a high-level description of the site and the proposal. I will then provide a summary of the Department's assessment and conclusions on the key issues associated with the proposal. So the site is located in the south-eastern part of Glebe Island, which is currently vacant, and it includes the adjacent deep-water shipping berth.

Glebe Island and the surrounding area has supported a range of industrial and port-related uses for well over 100 years, and the site continues to be used for industrial and port-related uses today. Glebe Island remains one of the port facilities closest to Sydney – Sydney CBD and is one of the few deep-water wharfs west of the Sydney Harbour Bridge. The area surrounding the site includes the heritage-listed Glebe Island Bridge, the ANZAC Bridge and the Glebe Island silos. The closest residential area is Pyrmont, which is located approximately 175 metres to the east. Other residential areas include Glebe, which is about 400 metres to the south, and Balmain, about 500 metres to the west.

The proposal before the Commission today seeks approval for the construction and operation of aggregate handling and concrete batching facility, which would supply concrete to the building and construction industries. The aggregate handling facility would receive sand, cement and other materials used to make concrete by ship and road, store them onsite and then transfer it to other batching plants around Sydney. The batching plant is a separate enclosed facility which would be used to combine the materials and make the concrete. This facility would operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and produce up to a million cubic metres of concrete each year.

The proposed facility is needed to supply concrete materials to the building and construction industry, particularly for some of the infrastructure projects that are either underway or planned across Sydney, such as the Sydney Metro West and the Western Harbour Tunnel projects. Community consultation is an essential part of the planning system and has played an important role in our assessment of the proposal. The Department publicly exhibited the proposal for five weeks, and members of my team met with residents both onsite and online to gain a better understanding of the community's concerns. We also consulted with the City of Sydney Council, the Inner West Council, and a range of government agencies, including the Port Authority of New South Wales and the Environment Protection Agency.

Key issues raised during consultation included whether there was a strategic justification for the proposed development, as well as visual, noise, air quality and traffic impacts. In direct response to the feedback, the proposal has been amended to reduce its size by approximately 13 per cent, and relocate the noise-generating activities further away from residential homes. Additional noise mitigation measures have also been included, such as using dedicated quieter ships to deliver materials to the facility, and installing brake silencers on concrete trucks. Also, trucks have been capped to 182 movements per hour, down from the original proposal of 286 per hour.

So that provides a bit of a high-level summary. I'm going to now move into a number of the key assessment issues that we considered as part of our assessment of the proposal, the first being the strategic justification. The Department undertook a detailed assessment of the – of the strategic planning framework that applies to the site. The proposal is permissible with consent under existing planning rules and is consistent with the Ports and Employment and Maritime Waters Zone objectives for the site. It's also consistent with state infrastructure strategy, the New South Wales Freight & Ports Plan, the Greater Sydney Regional Plan, all of which identify a strategic need to retain Glebe Island and White Bay as a working port to support inner city construction projects and limit the number of vehicles on roads.

The site is also well-placed to supply concrete to nearby infrastructure and construction projects within the Sydney CBD and surrounding areas, and the use of ships to deliver materials would substantially reduce the number of truck movements on Sydney roads. We have also considered the proposal against the recently released draft Bays West Planning Strategy, which confirms that Glebe Island and White Bay should be retained as a working port to support the New South Wales economy and the maritime character of the site and area. The strategy requires that landowners and stakeholders need to work together to consider how the future port and maritime functions can evolve and innovate over time to contemplate other future uses within the Bays West area.

Following careful consideration, the Department is therefore satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the current and emerging strategic planning frameworks that apply to the site. I'm going to move on to the visual impacts. We considered that visual impacts of the proposal would be acceptable, given that the proposal sits against the backdrop of an existing industrial waterfront area, which includes significantly larger structures such as the Glebe Island silos. We're also satisfied that Pyrmont residents would maintain their district views of the harbour and beyond, given the proposal is located 150 metres away from the nearest residence, and that the majority of views towards the water, the ANZAC Bridge and other key features would not be obstructed, though the view impacts from the ANZAC Bridge would be acceptable given the views already contained more dominant features, including the Glebe Island silos.

We are therefore satisfied that the visual impacts are acceptable and consistent with the impacts already expected from development within a port and employment zone. In relation to air quality impacts, we engaged an independent expert, Todoroski Air Sciences, to review the applicant's air quality impact assessment. This independent review concluded that the project would not result in any significant air quality impacts, and noted the project uses best practice controls to minimise emissions, such as enclosing the batching plant and conveyors. We accept the findings of the independent review and conclude that the proposal is acceptable, as it's predicted to meet all relevant air quality criteria at sensitive receivers and incorporates best practice controls for managing emissions.

Further, the EPA did not raise any concerns about air quality, and the proposal would also be regulated through the Environment Protection licence which is required for the site. We recommended a range of requirements through conditions of consent to minimise air quality emissions, including preparing and implementing an operational
5 air quality management plan and ongoing dust monitoring. Just moving on to noise impacts, we carefully considered the issues raised by the community and the relevant noise policies pertaining to the site, including the Port Noise Policy and the noise policy for industry. We also requested the applicant implement additional noise mitigation measures to further reduce noise impacts.

10 In response, the applicant committed to using dedicated quieter vessels to deliver materials to the facility and to minimise ship noise. We have also committed to installing brake silencers on concrete trucks and enclosing the batching plant and conveyors to minimise impacts to residents. With these measures in place, the
15 proposal would comply with the noise criteria in the Port Noise Policy and the noise policy for industry in the residential areas of Glebe and Balmain at all times. While there would be some exceedances of the noise policy industry criteria at the nearest residence in Pyrmont, these residence were constructed with inbuilt noise attenuation in the commission of their proximity to a working harbour, meaning they're already
20 built to withstand some higher noise levels.

We have also recommended strict noise limits for development, and given the Port Noise Policy aims to reduce noise over time, we have also recommended a condition that would allow lower noise limits to be applied in line with any future changes to
25 the Port Noise Policy. We have also recommended conditions requiring regular noise monitoring for all activities, implementing an operational noise management plan and noise verification requirements to confirm the development complies with the noise limits. Importantly, we have also recommended a condition requiring a community consultative committee is established to meet regularly with residents
30 and to ensure that issues can be raised and resolved in a timely manner.

With these proposed conditions in place, we believe that noise impacts can be appropriately mitigated and managed to an acceptable level. In terms of traffic
35 impacts, we consider that traffic impacts associated with the proposal are acceptable, given the maximum number of truck movements would be capped to 182 per hour until the Rozelle Interchange is open. This would also ensure that the intersection of The Crescent and City West Link would not be adversely impacted at peak times. We also note that all other intersections would only experience an additional 10-second delay during peak times. The use of ships rather than vehicles to deliver raw
40 materials would also reduce the number of truck movements on the Sydney road network, and we have recommended conditions prohibiting truck movements on local roads, such as Robert Street in Balmain.

45 As I have mentioned above, we have recommended a number of strict conditions to ensure the impacts of the proposal can be appropriately mitigated and managed. I'm just going to give a quick summary of these conditions again. They include applying strict noise criteria based on the best achievable noise levels for the proposal,

- sourcing a dedicated quieter vessel to supply raw materials to the facility to ensure noise from ship berthing is minimised, capping the allowed number of truck movements, prohibiting trucks on local roads, requiring a landscape management plan to soften and screen the proposal, and a public art strategy, requiring that a
- 5 community consultative committee to meet regularly with residents and action groups so issues can be raised and resolved in a timely manner, and requiring management plans to be prepared in consultation with councils and government agencies to ensure that noise and air quality issues are managed appropriately.
- 10 So just in conclusion, given the site strategic location, the need for a facility and the recommended conditions to manage impacts, we feel this proposal is approvable. We believe the proposal represents best practice in relation to minimising air and noise impacts. It's in the public interest, as it would supply concrete in close
- 15 proximity to the Sydney CBD and major infrastructure projects, supporting the construction industry and the broader economy, while minimising road traffic. Now, a detailed consideration of the project can be found in our assessment report which is available online. That's pretty much our overview of the project, so thank you for your time this morning.
- 20 MS TUOR: Thank you. Is Cameron Sargent speaking, or it's – it's just - - -
- MS SARGEANT: No, no, it was just going to be me, but happy to take questions.
- MS TUOR: All right. I will just see if there's any questions from Dr - - -
- 25 DR P. WILLIAMS: Do you want me to go first, or - - -
- MS TUOR: Yes. Do you want to go first?
- 30 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thanks, Annelise. Sorry, Anthea, just a couple of questions. Firstly, in relation – I will start off with traffic, if I could. You mentioned that – I think it was 286 movements originally. That has been reduced per hour. Truck movements. That's reduced to 182. Do you have a basis of the selection of
- 35 those numbers and that reduction? Was that something proposed by the applicant or something by the Department?
- MS SARGEANT: I might refer that to either Cameron or Karl, if you know the answer to that. Otherwise we would need to take it on notice.
- 40 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. That's – that's fine if you – I – I was also going to ask how long the – this reduction will last. I think you might have answered that question. It was till the Rozelle Interchange is open.
- MS SARGEANT: Correct. Yes.
- 45 DR WILLIAMS: You also talked about capping of truck movements, so I presume by capping you mean capping at 182 movements per hour until the Rozelle

Interchange is open, then increasing that cap to 286 after the interchange is opened?
Is – would that be correct?

MS SARGEANT: Cameron or Karl, are you there?

5

MR K. FETTERPLACE: Hello. Yes. Hopefully you can hear me. Yes. So the 182 number has come from the applicant's revised RTS, which suggested placing a cap based on the impact that had been assessed in the EMP period, and it was proposed, yes, that it would be in place until the opening of the Rozelle Interchange, which would then require a reassessment based on the changes to the traffic network that would be alleviated to some extent by the opening of the new motorway.

10

MS TUOR: So any increase would be dependent on that further assessment once the motorway is open?

15

MR FETTERPLACE: That's correct.

MS TUOR: So it's not an automatic thing that after the motorway is open you go from the 182 to 286. It would be an assessment based on the traffic conditions that exist at that point in time.

20

MR FETTERPLACE: That's correct. The way the consent has been recommended is that that condition is in place and the consent would need to be modified.

MS TUOR: All right. Thank you.

25

DR WILLIAMS: All right. Thanks. Just one further question, if I could. Just in terms of the strategic context, there's – there are various strategic plans that the state government has produced over the last several years that cover this area. Well, not just this area, but also the surrounding part of Sydney. Does the Department see this therefore as being a suitable long-term use, in terms of, like, the working harbour commitment, particularly for this part of Sydney Harbour, around Glebe Island and White Bay? By long term, I mean moving 10 years, 15 years; is this seen as being something that's consistent with a longer-term vision?

30

35

MS SARGEANT: So the draft strategy that has recently been prepared – and I acknowledge there has been a number of strategies in the past but I'm just referring to the most recent one. It's deliberately flexible, so in that it can accommodate a number of different land uses based on still maintaining and operating ports and maritime activity within the area, but it also acknowledges that landowners and key stakeholders would need to work together to establish what some of these future land uses would be. There aren't any detailed planning that has been undertaken for subprecincts at this stage, so there still needs to be more work to work through what – you know, what those future subprecincts might look like and to manage any conflict between those. So it's kind of a roundabout way of saying that, you know, while the strategy envisages a combination of land uses including ports and maritime

40

45

facilities, it hasn't actually articulated what specific land uses would be required in this location, and it is a 40-year – sorry, it's a – it's a plan that goes beyond 2040.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Annelise.

5

MS TUOR: Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks.

10 MS TUOR: Just in relation to noise, can you explain a bit further just what the sources of noise are. Is it the – the boat is the main source of noise? Is it the truck movements, or is it the actual activities within the building? Just so we get a better understanding about how noise is being generated.

15 MS SARGEANT: Karl or Cam, are you able to answer that question?

MR FETTERPLACE: Sure. Yes. Thanks, Anthea. In terms of the land-based noises would come from the concrete batching itself, truck movements and the aggregate handling, and then the water-based noise-generating activities include
20 ventilation of the vessels with generators running, and then also the unloading of materials from the vessels.

MS TUOR: So specifically in relation to things like the aggregate handling, is your
25 understanding that that – that that occurs actually within the aggregate silo buildings, or is it external to it? We will ask this of the applicant as well, but at the moment we have just got a bit of confusion about actually how the aggregate goes into the trucks, and whether it's an internal operation or an external operation.

MR FETTERPLACE: Well, the aggregate placement into the trucks would be
30 external, or partially external, at least, in that the trucks would drive underneath the aggregate silos, which would then unload into the trucks as they moved along, and then they would exit the site and out to deliver the aggregate. However, the concrete batching activities would be undertaken in an enclosed building. The only openings to that building would be time-limited roller doors, which would, of course, be
35 necessary to allow the trucks into and out of the building itself, but otherwise it's fully enclosed.

MS TUOR: And that activity of the concrete batching, you mentioned that that is
40 one of the noise-generating activities, but we note that in – that there's no requirement for the materials of that building to be specified to be noise attenuating. Is that something that was looked at at all, as to whether potential noise levels would be reduced if the building were constructed with a noise attenuating material, or is that - - -

45 MR FETTERPLACE: That's – our assessment looked at the fact that it was enclosed, and that has been taken into account, you know, in – through the

applicant's noise impact assessment and then the Department's assessment, with COLORBOND steel, I believe was the material.

5 MS TUOR: All right. And then just in relation to visual impact, I note the
conclusion in your – from the visual impact assessment was that from two locations
the – the visual impact would be high to moderate, and that, as I understand it, this
would be mitigated or endeavoured to be mitigated through a landscaping plan and a
public art strategy. Some of the discussions that we have had with the applicant and
10 the Ports Authority indicate that landscaping of the site of any sort of substance or
any depth – heightened depth would not necessarily be feasible on the site. So I just
– if you could explain further how you envisage that landscaping would be able to be
used to mitigate the visual impacts, particularly of the silo building. Firstly get
any further comment on that.

15 MR C. SARGENT: I'm – I'm happy to answer that question. Look, the Department
looked, obviously, at the – the visual impacts and – and acknowledged that the silo
structures themselves, they are quite large. They are quite tall, but in comparison to
the Glebe Island silos, they are certainly far less in their length and they're slightly
shorter in their height. But the view was taken that the – the public art strategy
20 would assist in sort of mitigating or providing some sort of visual interest to perhaps
the – the silo structures themselves, similar to what we have at the Glebe Island silos,
and that in conjunction with the landscape plan, that would see the lower elements of
the – the facility from the residential buildings to the east would sort of assist in
providing some sort of visual interest and assist in mitigating those visual impacts.

25 So the – the landscaping component, we – we acknowledge that this site is a little
constrained. However, we did feel that some sort of green wall – now, that could be
comprised of planters, etcetera. That could be mounted to the shipping containers –
would provide some sort of – sort of visual interest and soften the proposal from the
30 – from the east, and that would probably not prevent the – all the vehicles that are
coming into and out of the site. They would not be visible behind that wall. And
then the silo structures themselves, getting some sort of public art or – or some sort
of public art strategy in place to try and determine how best to provide some visual
interest, just build a shield or screen or sort of industrial-type structures that are
35 going to be present onsite.

MS TUOR: All right. So as I understand it, the – they're about 18 metres long, and
I think we have got some recent figures about the height and they're about 34 metres
40 high; is that correct?

MR SARGENT: That's correct. It's our understanding that is the ridge of the – of
the roof above the silos themselves, where the silo – the – the top part of the silos is
about 30.

45 MS TUOR: Yes. Okay. So it's essentially and 18 metre by about 15 metres wide
by 30 metres, with a ridged roof above it up to 34 metres.

MR SARGENT: That's – that's correct, and – that's correct, and so the – the intent, I guess, behind the public art strategy was looking at – essentially, that is a blank wall and that is a fantastic opportunity there to provide some sort of public art. We have recommended a public art strategy be in place. Now, you know, we would be
5 happy to take on board any – any comments or suggestions about perhaps reworking the condition so it's a bit more outcomes-based than – than what is currently worded, so it's quite clear as to what our intention is for, for example, the silos, how we would like some public art incorporated on them. We accept that and – and we're more than happy to – to sort of come up with some alternate wording.

10 MS TUOR: So in terms of the public art, it's potentially being something that would be stuck on to that building, as opposed to anything that – given the constrained nature of the site, the ability to sort of move in the night or have exposed structure or sort of – any of those sorts of things would be fairly limited. It would be
15 more the – an applied finish; is that what you envisaged by the public art? It's a graphic sort of thing.

MR SARGENT: Look, yes, that's right, some sort of graphic representation. How that will be applied, we would obviously have to speak to the applicant about how
20 best that would be done. Obviously, also in consultation with the community as well, because there's – there – you know, the condition itself does require consultation, and so those fine details could definitely be determined at a – at a bit of a later date.

25 MS TUOR: All right. Thank you. They're my questions. Anything else?

DR WILLIAMS: No, that's all. Thanks, Annelise.

MS TUOR: All right. Thank you very much. So the next speaker we have is from
30 the – yes. So we have got – from the applicant, we have got Scott Tipping and Andrew Driver, both representing the applicant, and I understand Scott Tipping is going first.

MR S. TIPPING: Thank you. I assume I'm coming through?

35 MS TUOR: Yes, you are.

MR TIPPING: Thank you. Good morning, Commissioners. Thank you for this opportunity to present. My name is Scott Tipping and I'm employed by Hanson as
40 the regional general manager for eastern region, which incorporates New South Wales and ACT. My colleague Andrew will present following me. Andrew's presentation will overlap, and he will hone in on more detail and provide additional context. With this in mind, I will focus my time on a couple of key considerations. By way of introduction, I also think it's important that I provide a brief outline of –
45 of Hanson. We are one of the world's leading construction materials company and form part of a

In Australia, we operate concrete, aggregate, construction materials recycling, and asphalt operations, with a presence in every state and territory. In Australia, we employ approximately 4000 people who fulfil a range of jobs, from driving our trucks, batching and testing our concrete, to operating plant at our aggregate and recycling facilities. We have a long and very proud history in Australia, with our Australian business founded in Sydney as pioneer by Sir Tristan Antico in 1949. As I mentioned in opening, I stated that I would focus on a couple of key considerations. The first of these is, why Glebe Island? To answer this, I will delve a little deeper into concrete.

Concrete is an essential material for construction and is used in construction projects. We supply concrete to projects that form the fabric of our society and our communities, hospitals, roads, tunnels, metro train developments, airports, ports, schools and homes. Examples local to Glebe that we have been involved with are the duplication of the bridge, construction of apartments through Pyrmont and the city, including apartment towers at Jacksons Landing in Pyrmont, the Cross City Tunnel, improvement works at the Sydney Opera House, WestConnex, Sydney Metro, and many, many more. Every person in Sydney relies on aggregate and concrete. We take it for granted, but right now, you're likely in a building whose very foundations are made from these products.

Unlike many other construction materials, concrete needs to be produced local to its end use. This is due to the fact that it has a short shelf life and needs to be placed quickly post-batching to ensure quality considerations are met. Timeframes associated with the placement of concrete are stipulated in Australian standards, as well as many concrete specifications. With the high-spec nature of CBD projects, this is even more critical. As an example, the engineering considerations for a metro station or a high-rise building are significantly more complex and critical when compared with something like a suburban detached home or a footpath. While quality is always key, with high-spec projects it is paramount, with time being of utmost importance to ensure the concrete performs as designed.

For this reason, every city including Sydney has a network of concrete plants across the entire footprint of the city to ensure high quality concrete is able to be delivered wherever and whenever a construction project requires. If time was not critical, you would likely see centralisation of these dispersed networks. The point I'm trying to make here is you simply cannot do this with concrete. You need the production facilities close to the end-use location. If I now hone in on Glebe, the colocation of the concrete plant and ag depot on a deep-water berth has the potential to remove up to 65,000 truck movements from Sydney roads. This is associated with negating the need to transport a large portion of the site's raw materials, course aggregates, by road.

The benefits of this extend further, with relevant truck movements being negated along the entire road network, all the way to the quarry site in the Illawarra. Without a port, we will continue to supply these projects with all the raw materials trucked in. It's very important to note the batch plant does not create the demand for concrete.

The Sydney construction industry creates the demand and this demand needs to be met to ensure projects are delivered on time, on budget and cost-effectively. The additional truck movements case with the port provides substantial consideration in regards to safety, amenity and congestion along the entire road network from quarry to concrete plant.

The second point I want to explore is our 2014 development approval at Bass Point Quarry. In 2014, the Department of Planning approved Bass Point Quarry for the extraction of four million tonne of aggregate. In this approval, road transport was restricted to three million tonne per annum, with shipping the other transport option to facilitate extraction up to the full approval limit. Without approval at Glebe, the Bass Point approval, and very specifically, the maximum extraction limit of four million tonne per annum is isolated without an end destination for the shipment of aggregate. An approval at Glebe Island would provide a coherent relationship between our 2014 Bass Point approval and the operation of an aggregates depot at Glebe.

Without an approval at Glebe, our maximum extraction approval of four million tonnes becomes redundant. This has potential to impact investment, jobs and all materials supplied for the future construction of Sydney. In summary, when considering an approval at Glebe, please take these two key points into account. Glebe is the only suitable and viable location in Sydney for the co-located batch plants and aggregates depot with raw materials delivered by ship to supply the demand created by the Sydney CBD construction pipeline. An approval at Glebe Island will provide a coherent relationship between our 2014 Bass Point approval and the operation of an aggregates depot at Glebe and close to Sydney. Commissioners and audience, thank you very much for your time.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much. Andrew Driver.

MR A. DRIVER: Good morning, all. Thank you very much. My name is Andrew Driver. I'm the development manager for Hanson New South Wales. I'm just going to go over some of the things that Scott Tipping was talking about and also what the compartments mentioned in the presentation PowerPoint presentation strategies. Just bear with me. The importance of concrete and aggregates, which have been touched on by Scott a little bit. Premixed concrete is used in almost all construction projects. These types of construction projects are fundamental to economic growth, and a reliable local concrete supply is the foundation of delivering these projects efficiently, affordably and in an environmentally sustainable way. Just some examples of recent projects that we have worked on, Sydney Metro Northwest Rapid Transit System, and also the Alford's Pt Bridge.

Supply flexibility is crucial. Concrete batching plants are required to operate in a flexible manner, 24/7 hours a day and having a production capacity not just on a yearly basis but also weekly, monthly and, critically, on an hourly basis to respond to the needs of construction design requirements, and project delivery programs. Furthermore, as it has been said before, concrete batching plants need to be located

in close proximity to the areas of demand. A good example of this is the M5 project down in St Peters. As you can see here, that's a night-time pour, that pour pretty much went all around the clock, and if you see Hanson trucks and some – that particular round, that particular pour. Another example of where we go and what we do, this is down in the tunnels. Again, to get down there, it takes a good supply of reliable concrete trucks and batch plants to support that, and Glebe Island in showing of these major infrastructure projects. And again, there's another example, that's also down in St Peters on the M5, of Hanson supporting the infrastructure construction work for

5

10 Major project specifications are also changing, and this has been mostly driven by the government requirements. TfNSW and RMS can require concrete to be delivered and placed onsite within 45 minutes from the time it is batched and mixed water. And this is quite difficult when you think about having to get around Sydney road network and the traffic, and also trying to access onsite. Example of this is when we participated in the M4 widening, just getting the trucks to, just getting the trucks on the job - it's also difficult as well. And everybody needs to remember that concrete is a perishable product. If you have a look at that picture there you can see that there are some examples of ways concrete, that's what you don't want to happen when you can't get to the job on time.

20

So why is Glebe Island important to not only Hanson but also the supply of aggregates? According to the Supply and Demand Profile of the Geological Construction Materials for the Greater Sydney Region, 2019, which was commissioned by the Department of Planning, the per capita consumption of extractive materials is around 3.5 tonnes per person per annum. And if you have a look at the – the picture on the left-hand side, there's a little green marker where it shows the location of the Glebe Island facility, and that blue circle represents the radius supply catchment that facility will provide aggregates for. And on the right-hand side is the table that shows the LGAs within that – that area, and the populations. And as you can see, there's about a million people living in that area that would be serviced by this – this facility, and

25

30

Glebe Island Hanson's concrete currently we supply 35% of concrete requirements of the City of Sydney within that – that radius. Based on a supply requirement of around three and a half million tonnes per annum, as from the slide I just showed, and the surrounding areas, Hanson's proposed Glebe Island concrete batching plant should have the capacity to produce up to 1 million cubic metres, which will require about two million tonnes of aggregate. Co-location of a concrete batching plant with aggregate shipping facilities offers several logistical benefits, which include the removal of 65,000 trucks from Sydney's major roads 11,000 tonnes of CO2 emissions to be taken off the roads, and we will also reduce our contribution to Sydney's traffic congestion. And the location is very proximate to that significant demand to enable batched concretes within that 45-minute window. Also, having access to a deep water port, as Scott mentioned before, will enable importation of aggregates from Bass Point Quarry which we already have that capability.

35

40

45

As I said before, Hanson is a major supplier of concrete to the WestConnex projects and will continue to supply around about 1000 cubic metres of concrete per day, which takes about 2000 tonnes of aggregates. On a yearly basis, that's about 300,000 cubic metres of concrete or 600,000 tonnes of aggregates. This is supplied
5 both during the day, the night, Sundays and public holidays. We will also tender and supply concrete to the following projects: Crowsnest Station, which is about 40,000 cubic metres or 80,000 tonnes of aggregates, the Pitt Street Station, 50,000 cubic metres or 100,000 tonnes of aggregates, Barangaroo Station also 50,000, or 100,000 tonnes of aggregates Metro West-Central Package which is about 200,000 cubic
10 metres of concrete or 400,000 tonnes of aggregates, Warringah Freeway Upgrade, which is 100,000 cubic metres or 200,000 tonnes of aggregates, the Western Harbour Tunnel, which is 100,000, or 200,000 tonnes of aggregates, and the big one, the Northern Beaches Link, which is about 400,000 cubic metres or 800,000 tonnes of aggregates. All of these projects will require flexibility to supply 24/7.

15 Importantly, Glebe Island to us represents a way that we can better manage our resources to meet customer demands. The way we manage our supply chains and – has changed in our requirement we have to provide dedicated stockpiles to ensure that we can – we can handle the traceability of raw materials and capable
20 management control from the quarry source to – to end use. Glebe Island facility which will help us to make of concrete design mix. As you can see, we only go a number of written products to ensure that they comply with high standards 100 years or more. There is no other site so close to Sydney's CBD area that is able to offer these attributes. Another example is the concrete supply into the
25 tunnels. As you can see there, we testing on and we do a fair bit of testing onsite as well.

Long-term tenure is also important, we are investing more than \$20 million in capital to support the construction industry and the continuation of Sydney's economical
30 growth as a globally competitive city. The proposal supports the New South Wales Government's ambition to maintain the last major working industrial port in Sydney Harbour. The New South Wales Government has already approved Hanson to export aggregates (up to 4Mtpa) from its Bass Point Quarry. Logically an approval of this nature would require a destination receival port with close proximity to the consumer
35 market. And maintaining Glebe Island as an aggregates receivable port on a long-term basis allows for possible sources of quarry materials from outside of the Sydney area, which we already know, has a limited life and resources. With this type of commitment being a key utility for both Sydney and Hanson, a long-term tenure is sensible, and paramount to ensure not only the required return on investment, but
40 also to support points above.

..... Glebe Island has historically been used as a shipping container terminal, for grain and car imports and transportation of bulk construction materials such as cement and gypsum. It is one of the remaining port facilities in close proximity to the Sydney
45 CBD and is one of the few deep-water wharves west of the Sydney Harbour Bridge. Glebe Island is currently used for common user berths, for importation of dry bulk goods such as sand or salt, and from time to time cruise ships. The next slide is

showing Hanson Batching Plant, the layout and also the montage of water from So we are seeking consent to construct a concrete batching plant with the capacity to produce up to 1 million cubic meters of concrete per annum and an aggregate handling facility with a shipping terminal at Glebe Island 1. We are also
5 seeking to go with six 34 m high aggregate silos compatible with the surrounding context, which included significantly taller structures such as the ANZAC Bridge, the Glebe Island silos, which are about 52 m and the buildings at Pymont, which are about 65 m high. Concrete batching building, which is about 15 m high and this is 5 m lower than the height of the Multi-User Facility. We will also require 7.8 m high
10 aggregate receiving bins We propose to use shipping containers stacked 3 high along the eastern boundary to a height of 7.8 m, and this is for acoustic and visual screening. The majority of the activities will be undertaken in the fully enclosed building to limit the noise and air impacts.

15 Just a quick overview of Hanson supply chain. So comes from quarries, it's delivered by tankers, aggregate tippers by ship to concrete plants, asphalt plants and aggregates depot, and from those facilities it's then trucked to our customers by concrete trucks and by tippers and customers are using the end products to build
20 bridges, roads, hospitals, schools, railways, airports, houses. The supply chain for this particular proposal, as you can see that the Hanson Bass Point is located just out of Wollongong near Shellharbour, and will be shipped, by sea obviously, up to Glebe Island. On the Glebe Island and we have marked up some of our concrete the blue ones are Hanson's aggregates from depot, we have a that was and also provide that we receive aggregates from the depot, and we also have a number
25 of other partner companies concrete plant in Alexandria Fulton Hogan Alexandria will likely rely on Glebe Island.

As for Glebe Island, the supply chain is at the Bass Point Quarry. As you can see we have existing shipload facility that used to ship aggregates up to Bay and we
30 want to reinstate that capability and ship to Glebe Island. The majority of raw materials consumed by the concrete batch plant will be feed directly from the aggregate depot silos. Some aggregates will need to be delivered by road transport to the batch plant because these raw materials (predominantly sand but also other aggregates due to specific government project requirements) are sourced from land-
35 locked quarries. BPQ approval to ship logically requires a port destination close to market.

Built form/aesthetics - there's a – a montage that shows the Hanson's facility adjoining the Multi-User. Interesting to note that the Multi-User has a larger
40 footprint. They are separated by a service road. Both sides are set back 18 metres from the edge of the common user wharf. This will provide potential control to the public access along the waterfront. As I mentioned, the – the Hanson facility is significantly smaller and lower in height. There is no operational/commercial connection with Multi-User however the Multi-User may be a potential source of
45 sand at some point of time. The next photo is – is a montage that shows Multi-User and the on the side. It is Working Harbour Port. This is the montage without the Hanson's facility and this is with the Hanson's facility.

In terms of visual impacts – the proposal sits against the backdrop of an existing industrial waterfront area, which includes significantly larger structures such as the Glebe Island silos in the background. Shipping is an existing activity associated with Glebe Island. The residents would still maintain expansive district views given the
5 separation distance of the proposal to private residents. The proposal would not impact on the views of Johnstons Bay or White Bay, due to its location on Glebe Island. The visual impacts are consistent with the impacts reasonably expected from development within port and employment zone.

10 In terms of the shipping container wall that has been referred down discussion the shipping container wall was proposed as a – as a – you know, an effective and efficient structure to mitigate such things as truck noise, truck headlights at night time the water and then there was some discussion about how green wall or a mural or it can remain in its original form shipping containers themselves and
15 then the maritime by As I mentioned before, it is consistent with the scale report used in the area. The proposal would not significantly impact on views towards the ANZAC Bridge or the Glebe Island silos. Now, we propose a visual mitigation measures such as murals or green walls to façade of the shipping containers.

20 In terms of transport and traffic, as mentioned before, we will lose up to 65,000 trucks per annum from the Greater Sydney road network. The development is predicted to generally maintain the level of service of the three nearby intersections until the Rozelle Interchange is completed. TfNSW/RMS did not object to the
25 transport/traffic impacts but sought further information which was addressed in our Response to Submissions. Again, in our response to the submissions, we limited to the maximum hourly truck movements to 182 per hour until the WestConnex Rozelle link Interchange is delivered. In terms of noise, there has been some discussions about shore-to-ship power. We worked with the Department of Planning and the
30 Port Authority to address this issue. We also investigated the capability of shipping providers to connect with this type of power supply and information that we were given is that there was no such ship that’s capable of being able to – to meet this at this stage. However, we are committed to sourcing a dedicated vessel for the proposal to ensure this shipping noise at berth is – is minimised and managed by
35 using a dedicated vessel.

We also include such measures as fully enclosing the batching plant including conveyors and using a 7.8 high metre shipping container wall to minimise the noise impacts. Another thing that’s minor but also critical is the inclusion of the use of air
40 release silencers on – on trucks. Hanson would also comply with the Port Authority’s Glebe Island Noise Policy and the EPAs noise policy for industry. Hanson will also conduct regular operational noise monitoring proposed. As far as air, the key mitigation measures in place, including the enclosure of the batching plant and conveyors and truck loading and unloading inside the building. Also more
45 than 11,000 tonnes of CO² emissions will be removed from Sydney’s roads. The Department, as they mentioned, commissioned a peer review by Todoroski Air

Services and the matters raised by Todoroski Air Services have been adequately addressed in our response to submissions.

5 Furthermore, Hanson will adopt an air quality management plan, which will include ongoing dust monitoring and will conduct post-commissioning air quality verification reports to demonstrate that mitigation measures are achieving compliance with the criteria, will minimise dust, odour, vapour and gas emissions throughout operation. So far, Hanson have been involved with the Glebe Island and White Bay community liaison group and we're happy to participate in that public art strategy that determine what the best outcomes are for the treatment of the site on aggregate silos as well as the shipping container noise wall.

15 In relation to the Department's assessment report, just need to make note again that 24/7 is crucial for modern day construction of projects, and it's also consistent with the multiusers approved hours of 24/7 operation. In terms of employment, we will create 90 construction jobs and 67 ongoing operational jobs, which is an economical boost to the State of New South Wales. The timing for us to construct this is expected to take 18 to 24 months, not the six to nine months originally envisioned, and this has come about through our detailed discussions with construction companies. In our response to submissions, we made a couple of concessions and amendments to reduce the footprint. We relocated noise generating activities further from the closest sensitive receivers and adopted measures to mitigate other noise impacts. We limited the number of maximum hourly truck movements to 182 until the Rozelle Interchange is operating.

25 In terms of the duration of use, we agree with the Department's assessment that there shouldn't be a limit imposed on consent, but the duration can be controlled through leasing agreements with the Port Authority of New South Wales. This will be consistent with the working harbour envisaged in the strategic planning documents for the site and surrounding areas and will facilitate urban renewal and the majority of construction projects. While the Department appreciates the long-term vision for Glebe Island, it includes opportunities for urban renewal, there still remains a strong imperative within the existing and emerging strategic planning to maintain and utilise Sydney's working harbour and we're pretty much in agreeance with that. In terms of construction noise, we will adopt a traffic management construction noise as well, and by – and by management plan, and there a number of other conditions the Department has imposed on this proposal and That's – that's the end of my presentation, so thank you for your time.

40 MS TUOR: Thank you very much. We have probably got a few questions. I will start off. Just in relation to some of the questions I asked the Department, particularly, say, with noise, can you just explain what the sort of hierarchy of the noise-generating activities on the site is. So is it the ship and then the truck movements, the concrete batching, the aggregates? Just give us a sort of feel for what the noise-generating activity is.

MR DRIVER: Probably the loudest noise-generating activity would be the concrete cuts themselves and their loading, and that will happen inside the building, and that's The aggregates delivered from the ship, once the aggregates are on a conveyor belt, it's generally activity other than the conveyor system itself. The transfer points between conveyors to conveyors is a source of noise. That's why we enclose those. In terms of shipping, we have not gone too far down that path, but we're in a process negotiating shipping providers, they're aware of the – the requirements for this project and they're aware of the – the noise policies that have been put in place by both the Port Authority and the EPA, and at this stage, we're on track to shipping In terms of the loading of the aggregates into tippers, this will occur beneath the aggregate silos themselves, so the – the noise transfer from the silos to the tipper bodies will be mitigated by having the silo structure above, and that's probably the main noise sources associated with the – with the proposal.

MS TUOR: All right. So just on that last one, as I understand it, you're saying that the loading of the aggregate into a truck would be inside the aggregate storage silos?

MR DRIVER: Beneath the aggregate storage silos, and will minimise the drop by – from the silos into the aggregate tippers.

MS TUOR: So when you say beneath it, there's – if you look on the site plan, the southern part of the site has – projecting out of the aggregate storage silos, it has a series of red squares, and it says Aggregate Truck Loading, and so the impression we get from that is that a truck would drive up underneath one of those squares and then the aggregate would be placed in the truck. Is that correct, our understanding?

MR DRIVER: At the time we were looking at a different load out system, but since we have had the discussion the – the Planning Commission, the – the way the trucks would be loaded will be on weighbridges underneath the aggregate silo themselves.

MS TUOR: So within the building itself?

MR DRIVER: Underneath the aggregate silo.

MS TUOR: Yes. I just don't understand what you say, underneath the aggregate silo. Is it to the south of the silo building, or does it go into the building itself?

MR DRIVER: The trucks will drive underneath the building itself, the structure itself. They will drive onto weighbridges and then that will be gravity-fed into the – into the trucks.

MS TUOR: So where you see sort of parking spaces 33, 34, 35, there would now be an entrance into the building there; is that what you're saying?

MR DRIVER: No, they will come in from the northern side of the aggregate silos and drive underneath. They will be loaded and then exit to the west.

MS TUOR: Okay. And then following on from that, you also mentioned that the concrete trucks, the loading of those is one of the major noise sources, but that would be occurring inside the building. Our understanding of it is that the buildings themselves are going to be corrugated iron, the metal – it's a metal-clad batching plant building, and that there's no actual noise attenuation in that material. So if it – things like the concrete batching is one of the major sources of noise, would the potential noise generated be reduced if noise-attenuating material were used in the construction of – of the metal-clad batch building, and similarly, the aggregate storage building silos?

10 MR DRIVER: My understanding is that when we provide the noise consultants with the details of the projects, they take that information and put it into their noise model. We have informed them it will be a metal-clad building which will house the batching activities. They have modelled that and modelling has demonstrated that it complies with the noise criteria. The Department have then taken it upon themselves to have a peer review by Todoroski Air Services, and they have also confirmed that that is the case.

MS TUOR: Well, that was in relation to air – the air quality, that modelling.

20

MR DRIVER: Beg your pardon?

MS TUOR: All right. And then I suppose in – just in terms of the traffic generation, the figure of 182, where did that figure come from? Is it sort of based on sort of an intersection capacity, or – or do you know where it actually came from, that figure?

25

MR DRIVER: I – I would have to take that one on notice. I do understand the 286 and the 182 might have been – there might have been two peak hour during the day, but notes.

30

MS TUOR: Okay. As I understand your – the peak operation of the facility in terms of your traffic isn't in the normal peak hour. It's in the 10 to 11 period; is that correct?

35

MR DRIVER: Yes, that's what the modelling demonstrated.

MS TUOR: But in the morning peak hour, The Crescent, as I understand it, the intersection there, with – with or without your development, is at a sort of fail level, or an F level, level of service F. Is that your understanding? That's with or without the development.

40

MR DRIVER: Yes, so – yes, so it currently – the way it currently operates is it's at the lowest level, and the Hanson proposal wouldn't – wouldn't change that level.

45

MS TUOR: And also, I understand that it's necessary to use The Crescent for the concrete trucks going to sites, that there may be sites that are actually within, you

know, the – the Leichhardt/Annandale area that will need to get access off The Crescent for deliveries for concrete trucks, but that it isn't actually necessary to use The Crescent for delivery of materials. Is that correct?

5 MR DRIVER: Yes, unless there's a – there's a need to use The Crescent for a local job, then we wouldn't be using The Crescent.

MS TUOR: So following on from that, the use of The Crescent as a truck route could be limited, which would then avoid that – using that intersection that's
10 identified as having quite severe problems at the moment, but you would need to use The Crescent for deliveries within that – within the area; is that correct?

MR DRIVER: So predominantly, our would be heading back to the main
15 intersection of and either turning right ANZAC Bridge or heading left and

MS TUOR: Okay. All right.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Annelise.
20

MS TUOR: Any questions? Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Andrew, I'm just trying to get a bit more of a handle
25 on the relationship between noise activities or procedures or processes that occur within the buildings and the truck movements themselves. Firstly, the – the enclosure, I understand that they're conveyor belts – the conveyors are all fully enclosed. The buildings are enclosed except when trucks have to go in, and then I think there's a roller door system to – so that they remain closed once the trucks
30 move in. The trucks that move into the concrete batching building, they drive into the building and that's all fully enclosed, so all the activity that takes – in terms of loading the trucks occurs within a fully enclosed building, in terms of the concrete batching building. Then with the aggregate building, the trucks similarly move within the building. Not beside it but actually within the building, and I think that's
35 what I'm still unsure about. They actually move through the – through the – the middle of the building to be loaded, or do they move to hoppers that are on the southern side of the building?

MR DRIVER: They – they move within the building.

40 DR WILLIAMS: They move within the building. Okay. Could you – okay. Could you then also explain some of the activities or the procedures that occur within the building? So, for example, in the concrete batching plant, the concrete is actually made/mixed inside the building and loaded into the concrete trucks? So that actual
45 activity takes place within the building as well?

MR DRIVER: That takes place within the building. The washing out of concrete trucks takes place within the building. The delivery of cement tankers which provide the cement powder for concrete production takes place within the building.

5 DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR DRIVER: The – the sumping of the concrete to – to check for compliance with the design requirements takes place within the building.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Okay. Thank you. And just – I'm just trying to think. The – the shipping containers, any particular reason why you have chosen three – a height of three shipping containers? Two? Four? Why three in particular? Is it to do with clearance of the conveyors, or is there any particular reason for that?

15 MR DRIVER: That's one of the reasons. It was also about mitigation of trucks travelling adjacent to the – the shipping containers, and also to eliminate the lights to shining across

20 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Right. Okay. And, sorry, just one final question. Just the sand deliveries. There will be a portion of sand deliveries that will have to occur by truck. Will there be sand deliveries by ship as well? From Bass Point, I mean. And – and then there will be sand deliveries from – from other sources by – by truck as well.

25 MR DRIVER: That's right. So we produce some sand at the Bass Point Quarry, but there are other types of sand that go into certain types of concrete mixes, and these sands come from quarries that have shipping capability, and essentially

30 DR WILLIAMS: All right. Good. Yes. Thanks, Annelise.

MS TUOR: Thank you. Just one more question. Just in relation to the visual impact and the art stuff, has – have you been able to have any – or do you have any idea about what sort of – your approach to the art strategy for the – particularly for the aggregate storage silos would be in terms of, you know, mitigating visual impact?
35 Any sort of comments or thoughts on that?

MR DRIVER: No, but we're happy to participate in – in some sort of consultation/stakeholder to work out what's the best solution for personally, I think the murals have been demonstrated, you know, across New South Wales to be
40 one effective way of – of treating a – a structure of that nature. I think existing silos personally that's my opinion, but I – I guess that Hanson is – is happy to – to contemplate whatever comes out of a public art strategy consultation process.

MS TUOR: And just confirming that the actual shape of the building, it doesn't
45 have the curved shape that was in the photo montages, that that has been an amendment since the original scheme to now to be more of a flat façade. Is that correct?

MR DRIVER: Correct. It's inherently far more difficult to – to do the first structure and – and

5 MS TUOR: And just in terms of the tolerances in terms of placement of the building – need for truck sizes, parking spaces, etcetera, etcetera, is there any scope for more articulation of the building to be achieved through the art strategy, or would it be more of a – just a – an applied finish, as opposed to the ability to sort of have exposed structure or – or more significant sort of changes in the form of the building?

10 MR DRIVER: Well, we're looking at treating the façade, and I think out of the consultation, the public art strategy piece, but I – I think we're quite limited in what we can do, given the amount of capital proposal.

15 MS TUOR: All right. Thank you. Any - - -

DR WILLIAMS: That's fine, thanks, Annelise.

20 MS TUOR: No. Thank you very much.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks.

MS TUOR: We appreciate your time.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

MS TUOR: So we are now going to have a morning break and we will reconvene at 10.45.

30 **RECORDING SUSPENDED** [10.15 am]

35 **RECORDING RESUMED** [10.45 am]

MS TUOR: Welcome back. Our next speaker will be Jamie Parker MP.

40 MR J. PARKER: Good morning. I hope that you're hearing me loud and clear.

MS TUOR: Yes, we are.

45 MR PARKER: Well, thank you very much for the opportunity to address you. And I did love that hold music. It really energised everyone, I think. First of all, I just wanted to say that I actually – well, I have a meeting with the Minister for Planning at 11.30 in Martin Place, so I need to leave Parliament after my presentation. So forgive me if I'm not able to listen to the rest of the presentations.

First, I just want to say that I understand that most of the issues relate to people living in the electorate of Sydney. I supported a submission from the member for Sydney, but today I wanted to address you in order to raise some of the context and some specific issues that I would encourage you to consider. By way of background,
5 I was first elected to the former Leichhardt Council representing the Balmain Ward in 1999, and I served in that role till 2011, including three years as the mayor from 2008 to 2011. And, of course, I've been the member for Balmain now for almost 10 years.

10 The Bays Precinct has been a really particular interest of mine for over 20 years. I've been involved directly in every development application in this area, and it's something I take very seriously. My father, I should also say, worked in White Bay, Cockatoo Island and all around that area from 1966 when he took up his first job in the Balmain shipyards, fixing engines, and he spent his whole life working in heavy
15 maintenance and engine repair. So there's a relationship that I have from my family ties but also through my work as a representative, and this land is very important strategically, historically and culturally for our community, and we have to make sure that these industrial uses are appropriately located and managed.

20 First, I share many of the concerns of residents in terms of the impacts, and also I share the concerns of the City of Sydney in terms of the potential impact on the planned reopening of the Glebe Island Bridge in terms of design impacts, heritage and visual impacts. I support their view that an alternative location further to the northeast of the existing Glebe Island Silo should be considered to reduce the visual
25 and acoustic impacts.

When I talk about impacts, I wanted to address noise in particular because historically there has been very poor noise management from key operators in the precinct. In particular, there's some important lessons we need to apply in this
30 assessment in regards to the way the cruise ship terminal was managed and is managed. You will recall that after 2013 when the cruise ship terminal was approved, eight out of the nine vessels did not meet the noise and light standards that were in the consent. It took the community five years to fight with complaints with the no visibility for information on noise or quality of data, no transparency.
35 They've lived with the port happily for many decades, but it took many years to try to come to a resolution, and what was that resolution? They varied the consent. They changed the permissible noise limits, increased those noise standards to make sure that those vessels would comply, and that's the PNP, the PNP that we're relying on today to protect residents.

40 The port has also spent millions attenuating people's homes, meaning they weren't able to open their windows in the evening, they weren't able to enjoy their private open space without intrusive noise. So we need to be aware that commitments need to be clear, and transparency is critical. So what I ask today is that if is not a
45 condition of consent, it doesn't exist, and transparency is critical and needs to be in a condition if you're of a mind to support it. So, for example, when it comes to noise, any consent should include the noise monitoring reports, the noise verifications. Any

routine attempted noise monitoring should be made publicly available on a relevant website for the public to examine. We shouldn't have to go through years of DPIE and arguments and fighting in order to get those basic documents.

5 For example, F16 lays out some very important noise compliant assessments. They should all be made publicly available and posted as soon as practicable on a website for the public to examine in the same way now Sydney Ports publishes all of the air quality monitoring from the White Bay Cruise Ship Terminal. When I refer to operational noise, I'm talking in particular about the recommendations that the
10 applicant uptake monitoring of batching plant operations, you know, obviously berthing and unloading of ships, any mitigation measures. All of that information needs to be publicly available. If it's not in the consent, the public will find it incredibly difficult to get it. So if you are of a mind to approve it, that is particularly important. I note the applicant has made a range of commitments about noise
15 management. They're positive. But if they're not in the conditions, they're not enforceable.

So there's a range of issues if you are of a mind to issue a consent, including enclosure of the batching plant, the time limit of opening of roller doors, fully
20 enclosing the conveyor feeds, the installation of air release brake silencers on the concrete trucks, the limiting of truck speeds to 20 kilometres an hour on the site. All of that needs to be in the consent. Otherwise, it's not enforceable. They've also suggested routine attendant noise monitoring to measure compliance. It needs to be in the consent.

25 There has also been the issue of contracting a quiet vessel. Well, if anyone has been involved in the White Bay Cruise Ship Terminal, you will know that one person's quiet vessel is another person's misery. So there should be specific conditions set around what that is to ensure that there's certainty for the applicant and certainty in
30 terms of the right vessel being contracted. Of course, the most effective way to ensure compliance is the implementation of a night owl curfew, which will be optimal for surrounding sensitive receivers. We've heard this before about the enclosure of structures. I note that with WestConnex with the sheds that they have in different areas where they're doing all of the work for the – they're all attenuated
35 sheds rather than Colorbond sheds to minimise noise impact, and that's something that should be considered.

If I can move now to air quality standards, I note that it applies with the applicable air quality standards on PM2.5, 10, knocks and socks. I have a lot of experience and
40 we have, our community, because of the western – the White Bay Cruise Ship Terminal. Just for your information, those standards are amongst the worst in the world. If you look up parts per billion, even with something like sulphur, the Australian standard is more than double the standard that would be acceptable in the United States or in Canada. So while we comply, it would not be acceptable in
45 North America, it wouldn't be acceptable Europe, and it should not be acceptable here, but our air quality standards are so poor.

Now, the department has recommended a range of conditions to minimise air emissions, you know, operational air quality management plans, ongoing dust monitoring. Again, if you're of a mind to approve this application, all of those post-commissioning reports, everything should be publicly available, and that should be included as a condition of consent. Our experience is we simply can't get it if it's not a condition of the consent. They will claim commercial-in-confidence. A whole lot of things will be claimed. So it's important that they are made publicly available.

Two other issues briefly, one on traffic. You may know there was a lot of controversy around the relationship between The Crescent and the City West Link. Over 1000 public submissions were made. Obviously Annandale is in my electorate, as is Glebe and Ultimo. That level of service will be at an F. It will be at an F post the opening of the interchange. So any steps that you can take to limit the use of heavy vehicles in that interchange should be considered and should be part of the condition of consent. And I encourage you to have a look at Transport for New South Wales' final version and the traffic management reports in there that indicate that intersection is a very poor performing intersection and it will continue to be so.

Finally, I want to address the issue of visual appearance. Obviously, the scale, the bulk and the massing of it represent a very prominent visual intrusion, and you're essentially trading off the visual impact versus the traffic and trucking congestion impact. It's a very challenging opportunity because there's very little space for deep plantings. But if there is something that – for example, a Greenwall that's being considered, it's very important that a maintenance plan be part of any potential consent because time and time again, we see Greenwalls proposed, no maintenance plan and then the performance of that wall deteriorates and is taken down.

I didn't want to steal the thunder of a lot of the local residents who are raising issues. Obviously we're seriously concerned about the proposal. I encourage you to consider the concerns of residents in particular, and if you are of the view of providing any approvals, proposals by the applicant must be in the conditions of consent, and any documents that are required as a condition of consent must be made publicly available as soon as practical. Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much. I understand you have to rush off, so we won't bother with any - - -

MR PARKER: I've got to go down to Martin Place for a meeting at 10.30, so I have to leave in a few minutes.

MS TUOR: All right.

MR PARKER: But thank you for the opportunity.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much. I will just check. Have you got any other - - -

DR WILLIAMS: No. That's fine. Thanks.

MS TUOR: No. We're fine. Thank you very much.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

5 MS TUOR: The next speaker is Elizabeth Elenius from Pymont Action Inc.

MS E. ELENIOUS: Thank you very much. I speak on behalf of members of Pymont Action but also as a resident of 2 Bowman Street in Pymont, the closest apartment building to the site of the proposed Hanson's Concrete Batching Plant. I have also
10 been a community representative for around 15 years on the Port Authority's Glebe Island White Bay Community Liaison Group and have been involved in discussions on this proposal since it was first raised as a concept. Since we submitted our comments on the original plans for this facility, the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment has released the draft Bays West Place Strategy in March 2021.
15 This strategy reinforces the government's commitment to the continuance of working harbour uses in this precinct set out in its direction 3:

*Retain, manage and allow the essential strategic port and maritime industry uses to grow and evolve to ensure they continue to support the New South
20 Wales economy.*

At our recent meeting, members of Pymont Action again reinforced their commitment to working harbour uses at Glebe Island, including the construction of the port's multi-user facility and the concrete batching plant. We did so in the
25 knowledge that the strategy seeks novel and innovative ways to integrate built form with provision of public domain. One suggestion is to build public space over both facilities. This has been successfully achieved on the Barangaroo Headland, which incorporates public space beneath the recreated public park. This approach would further ameliorate any impacts which may arise in the transfer of construction raw materials into and from the facilities. We strongly support this approach but
30 recognise that it may be a longer-term aspiration. So I will now address my remarks to the proposal under consideration by the Commission.

Noise. To address the noise concerns of nearby residents, we recommend that
35 Hanson's be required to restrict its operations, including delivery of raw materials from ships and the subsequent loading of concrete tankers, to 12 hours per day, avoiding late night operations where possible. The proponent should also be required to adequately line ship to shore conveyor systems with noise insulating materials, and I would add similarly line the outer cladding of the facilities, as I
40 understand from previous speakers that that may not be happening. We also recommend that Hanson's investigate early installation of a pipeline to Cement Australia just across the other side of the island to their – of a pipeline to Cement Australia silos on the island to avoid the need for the delivery of cement by trucks.

45 Hanson's should ensure that vehicles be equipped with the latest reversing warning technology, which removes the use of loud beeping, a policy now adopted by Ports Authority. Noise monitoring should be conducted in or close to nearby residential

buildings and any increase over the approved limits outlined in the EPSs noise policy for industry requirements addressed. Noting that vehicle manufacturers will cease making conventional vehicles from around 2030, early adoption of electric vehicle fleets by Hanson's would also reduce both noise and emissions from the plant's operations.

Air quality. Hanson's and Port Authority should install an air quality monitoring station in Pyrmont close to Glebe Island to collect more relevant baseline air quality data than that measured from Rozelle as proposed. Ships should also be required to ensure sulphur emissions comply with 2020 national regulations, using technology now successfully deployed by cruise ships docking at the White Bay Terminal. I think the previous speaker indicated that that was a fairly, you know, high emissions standard, but my understanding is that it's very – it's a very low emissions standard that has been adopted on sulphur. So that needs to be checked. The proposed silo should be fully enclosed to prevent air quality impacts on nearby residents and park users.

Sustainability. To achieve the objectives of the Bays West Place Strategy direction 7, which is to deliver a world-class sustainable precinct which is carbon neutral and delivers efficient management of energy, we recommend that Hanson's partner with the Port Authority in the installation of a solar generation and storage facility and require adaptation of the power systems of ships making deliveries to enable shore to ship power supply when docked. I believe that there is technology for this already in other parts of the world. We have also recommended that Hanson's should investigate the use of barges to transport concrete from Glebe Island to construction sites within the delivery catchment of the plant, noting that water transportation of both raw materials to the facility and the concrete from the plant takes many heavy vehicles off highways and local roads, assisting in lessening both traffic congestion and emission of pollutants into the atmosphere.

Visual amenity. We note that Hanson's has committed to developing a public art strategy and seek community consultation as has occurred with regard to the proposed mural of the southeast façade of the multi-user facility. That was one of the most successful consultations I ever participated in. In particular, we seek community input to considerations of the treatment of the container wall used to block views of the plant behind the wall. We strongly support the provision of local native trees and shrubs, if possible, to soften and screen the proposed facility, as recommended by DPIE. We also ask that Hanson's work with both the Port Authority and community representatives in developing a detailed lighting plan to ensure that light spills make minimal impact on affected residential areas, including from both onshore and on ship sources. I think this is – should be made a condition of any approval.

The Port Authority has instituted a three strikes and you're out policy if port lessees transgress any of the conditions imposed on their operations. We ask that this policy be imposed on Hanson's operations and during construction of the plant. In the event that IPCN approves the construction and operation of this controversial

industrial facility, we urge commissioners to ensure that its operations comply with world's best practice and become an exemplar of the way in which wealth creating industrial enterprises can operate in relative harmony with residential and commercial developments. After all, Sydney Harbour is one of or possibly is the
5 best deepwater harbour in the world, and the retention of existing working harbour facilities operating under world's best practice conditions should be hailed, not condemned. My partner and I bought our apartment overlooking Glebe Island because it was a working port, and many of my neighbours and I celebrate every large ship which docks there. Thank you very much.

10 MS TUOR: Thank you very much. Any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: I might just have one or two questions. Thanks very much, Elizabeth. Just understanding you've been involved in the ongoing community
15 engagement with Hanson over this project as well?

MS ELENIUS: Well, by the Port Authority CLG, yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. Right.

20 MS ELENIUS: They attend each of those meetings.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. Right. That's through the Pyrmont Action Incorporated?

25 MS ELENIUS: Well, I represent Pyrmont Action.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes.

MS ELENIUS: I also – beyond that, you know, I liaise with people in my building
30 and friends and neighbours as well.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. No. That's fine. And have you made a written submission to the Commission at this stage as well?

35 MS ELENIUS: No. I didn't

DR WILLIAMS: No. That's fine. I just - - -

MS ELENIUS: forward what I've just - - -
40

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. That'd be fantastic. Yes.

MS ELENIUS: - - - provided to you.

45 DR WILLIAMS: That'd be great. Thanks very much. Thanks, Annelise.

MS TUOR: All right.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks for your time. Thank you.

MS TUOR: That would be very useful if you could forward your comments.

5 MS ELENIUS: I will. Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: The next speaker is Professor Heiko Spallek.

15 PROF H. SPALLEK: Yes. Can you hear me both?

MS TUOR: Yes, we can.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

20

PROF SPALLEK: Dear members of the Independent Planning Commission, my name is Heiko Spallek. I'm a professor at the University of Sydney where I serve as the head of school and dean of the Sydney Dentist School. I have been a resident of Jacksons Landing in Pyrmont and owner of an apartment since March of 2021.

25 Before I begin my short arguments, I would like to acknowledge and pay my respects to the traditional owners of the land from which I'm talking and which we are talking about this morning, the Cammeraygal people, who have lived around Pirrama and Blackwattle Bay for tens of thousands of years. And I think when you raise concerns about our environment and sustainability, you also pay respect to them by following
30 their tradition of treating our land and our environment as something that needs to be preserved for many generations ahead.

I speak to you as a concerned citizen, as a healthcare professional, as an educator and someone who has observed urban development in four cities on three continents,
35 each over many years. The developments observed in Berlin, Germany, in Philadelphia in the US, in Pittsburgh in the US and in Parramatta in Sydney give me some insights in how cities evolve over time. Sydney is an aspiring green city attracting eventually after COVID again international students, and I would like to remind the members of the Commission that international education is the third
40 largest export in Australia, with 32 billion economic impact each year. These are data from before COVID.

The plans for an around the clock Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant and Aggregate Handling Facility would if approved begin the process of industrialising
45 the Pyrmont Peninsula again after successful efforts by the governments which have spent taxpayer money during the last 25 years encouraging the area to become a sought-after location for residential development by deindustrialising it. The CSR

sugar refinery was demolished, the car storage facility on Glebe Island was moved to Port Kembla, and the water police site was transferred to Balmain all during that time. This has allowed the Jacksons Landing development of over 1000 apartments to be completed and also the Pirrama Park to be established. To return this area to an industrialist base land with no consideration for the residents who have purchased apartments in this vicinity is abhorrent, I have to say.

I don't want to repeat what others have submitted here and the details about noise and other things which we mentioned already, but the resulting noise, the impact on heavy traffic to the wider area, the dust clouding the clear water of the entire harbour, the silt build-up from the dust once it settles, destroying the underwater marine life and the impact on other wildlife, such as birds, should be considered here. The plans we discussed today are at odds with the government's plans to redevelop White Bay into a waterfront destination. There is no compatibility between such a large scale industrialisation and urban renewal of Glebe Island and around. So I emphatically support the government's draft West Bay Strategy to make Glebe Island a potential waterfront recreation area. Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you. So just clarifying my understanding of what you've said is that you're saying you consider that the port activity is not what's envisaged by future strategic plans, that it's actually urbanisation, a change of use - - -

PROF SPALLEK: Yes.

MS TUOR: That's what's envisaged. Is that - - -

PROF SPALLEK: That's how I understand the planning document which I've read, and I don't think that they can go close to each other without constant conflicts.

MS TUOR: So your opinion is that if they were to try and have the two uses in the future that there would be ongoing conflict.

PROF SPALLEK: Yes. I mean, speakers referred before and Jamie also pointed out clearly that there are standards, and if they are not fully followed and not publicly made available, there will be a constant battle, in my opinion. And I see the ships at the moment stopping there from my balcony, and I can tell you everything which was mentioned takes place there every day. Light pollution, noise pollution and dust.

MS TUOR: All right. Thank you. Peter.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks.

MS TUOR: Yes. Thank you very much.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: The next speaker is Stephen Paull.

MR S. PAULL: Yes. Good morning.

MS TUOR: Good morning.

5 MR PAULL: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm a resident of the
building that looks across to Glebe Island, and I object to the Hanson proposal. My
wife and I downsized to Pymont because of its central location and the obvious
potential for the precinct. Frankly, I thought we had struck gold when we moved to
10 Pymont and the New South Wales – you know, with the New South Wales
Government's vision for Glebe Island and White Bay Precinct that's been
documented in various strategic plans, with the most recent one being the Bays West
Strategic Plan or Place Plan. Sadly, it's all been downhill from there.

I'm quite aware that I could be accused of being a nimby for objecting to this
15 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 your home. The objections to all of these issues have been
well-documented, and whilst the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
allege that the conditions placed on the applicant to mitigate the issues are
20 acceptable, residents surrounding the site would argue otherwise.

Given time constraints, rather than rehashing the objections about the likely
outcomes of a concrete batching plant, I thought it relevant to make some
observations around the process that underpins the DPIEs recommendation to accept
25 the Hanson proposal. My first observation is that most of the 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?

30 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, further, the applicant has committed to mitigation measures that includes
minimising ship noise “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
35 Island.

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 the decisions of tenure negotiated between Hanson and the Port Authority will
40 be driven by financial necessity and return on capital rather than the Bays West
strategic plan. In my opinion, there's a conflict of interest in this case, and the Port
Authority should not negotiate the tender – tenure.

My next observation is that the Hanson proposal is being looked at in isolation, it
45 was – as was the MUF, multi-user facility, 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. Another point to note is that the

Hanson proposal has been deemed a state significant development, and the DPIE state that it is in the public interest. I question if it is in the public interest to approve a state significant development without some sort of tender process, especially in light of the criticism heaped on the government for allowing Crown to proceed
5 without a tender.

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
10 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 as a manufacturer – 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 at all?
15

This is a perfect segue to my final and most critical reason for my objection. I have – I’m going to screenshare some artists’ impressions of what is proposed and what could be. Can everyone see – hang on a sec. Can you see that now?

20 MS TUOR: Yes, we can see it now.

MR PAULL: Yes. 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 to
25 Sydney, New South Wales 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 Barangaroo. Turning Glebe Island into a manufacturing site is not in the public interest and should not be allowed to proceed.
30

As a postscript to all my comments today, I belatedly read the publicly available transcript from the IPC meetings with DPIE on the 6th of 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.”
35

MS TUOR: I will just interrupt you there.

MR PAULL: This transcript - - -

40 MS TUOR: You’re actually going over time now. So do you need – how much longer would you need?

MR PAULL: I’m very close to finishing.

45 MS TUOR: Okay. So - - -

MR PAULL: 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.

5 MS TUOR: Thank you very much. I will just see if there's any questions. No. No questions.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

10 MS TUOR: Thank you very much. The next speaker is James Kelly.

MR J. KELLY: Hi there. Can you hear me?

MS TUOR: Yes, we can.

15

MR KELLY: Yes. Okay. So I'm very impressed with Stephen Paull's presentation just then, so I'd like to reiterate the great majority of what he just said. I think he put forward a very strong case. I have got some notes here. We purchased in 2010 in the Distillery, which is 45 Bowman Street. That's the yellowfin building directly
20 opposite Glebe Point Island and the proposed batching plant, so we're directly involved. I suppose my comments are this is public land, albeit a working port. This Hanson proposal would effectively be giving over public land to a public company to make money at the expense of the quiet enjoyment of thousands of residential residents and their children and families in and around Glebe and Pymont. So I
25 think that's important. You know, we're – this is a moneymaking exercise at the expense of a significant number of people.

The New South Wales State Government has allowed and encouraged Pymont to become one of the most densely populated residential areas in Sydney, so we all
30 bought in there in good faith. I'm not against a working port and enjoy the vibrancy of a well-run port that it can bring to the city. In fact, like Elizabeth's earlier comments, that was one of the attractions of buying there. However, what is now proposed by Hanson in way in excess of what would constitute a sensible and adaptive use for Glebe Island now the New South Wales State Government has
35 allowed so much residential building to take place nearby, and that doubles back to Stephen's excellent points earlier.

There must come a point in time when industrial uses in a growing city are modified or adapted to recognise the other uses in and around them. As we said earlier, the
40 CSR Sugar Refinery has been removed. There's other things. So you can't – the working port can't just be an excuse forever. That – it has always been a working port, it's always going to be. You can't have other development grow in and around it and not recognise that as we move forward as a city.

45 I sat through Andrew Hanson's presentation and respect his sales pitch, but what he has outlined, if approved, is, in my opinion, horrifying and significantly greater in potential disruption to Pymont and Glebe than I even appreciated previously.

Hanson outlined a significant number of current and upcoming development projects which Hanson claimed would all be supplied from the Glebe Point with the inference that they would all be at risk if Hanson didn't – was denied. Firstly, the quantum proposed, if approved, would turn Glebe Point Batching into one of the busiest and noisiest parts of Sydney full stop. This is in the middle of, you know, a residential area. I cannot imagine all the projects Hanson outlined will be stopped if Hanson does not get its approval. I'm 100 per cent sure either Hanson will find another location for its batching plant or a Hanson competitor will certainly step in and competitively quote to provide the required concrete from alternative locations.

10 I'm curious as to why Port Botany and the industrial area around Botany is not the preferred location for this type of batching plant. It has all of the same attributes, with port, wharves and plenty of industrial land not surrounded by residential, and Botany has some of the very best road network linkages across all of Sydney. I cannot understand how it is not a realistic alternative.

20 There seems to be a lot of discussion on the visual amenity of the proposed batching plant. To be blunt, it's a working port, and we already have dilapidated White Bay Power Station, the existing silos and the new White – the overseas terminal, which is attractive. So, in my opinion, the visual amenity is important, but that's not what's going to cause the significant stress. It's all going to come down to noise, dust and light pollution.

25 One thing that hasn't been raised is White Bay is a natural amphitheatre, and during the day, ambient noise effectively cancels ship and batching point noise out. So, with respect, if you go and visit the site now and you're standing there and you can hear a ship – you won't hear the ship because the ambient noise is going to block it out, but at night, when everything is quite, the bay basically amplifies all of the noise. At 4 am the other morning, I was woken up by a ship coming in. Now, I'm not saying ships shouldn't come in. I'm just making the point that at night, it can amplify. So was that my time or have I still got a minute?

MS TUOR: You've still got – you've got 45 seconds left, so - - -

35 MR KELLY: Okay.

MS TUOR: Keep going.

40 MR KELLY: So I think my major point is go and have a look at the fish markets, the batching plant there. There's dust and grime everywhere. Light pollution is a big problem, as we saw when they used to unload the cars there. It'd shine into everybody's windows. At Newcastle, they took the steelworks out. This to my mind is very similar. If somebody came into Newcastle town – city and said, "We're going to put the steelworks back in," you know, this – the port has moved on. Life has moved on. We are now living in Glebe, in Pyrmont in a very, very residential – it's a fantastic place to live with children, families, kids. You can go everywhere.

This is going to really detrimentally affect the area going forward if it's approved. I really – we're relying on you.

5 MS TUOR: All right. Thank you very much.

MR KELLY: Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

10 MS TUOR: So just one quick question. So I understand what you're saying is that you don't actually think that the ongoing port use is appropriate, that the area is - - -

MR KELLY: I don't think this use for the ongoing port is appropriate. I think if it had restrictions on hours, as, I think, Elizabeth said earlier, if it had a 10 or 12 hour
15 restriction, absolutely because then the noise will be ambient noise and will be blocked out by the daytime traffic – the daytime noise. My issue is, you know, once you get past about 8 or 9 o'clock at night till 6 or 7 o'clock in the morning, it just magnifies and reverberates around the bay, and I don't think anyone appreciates how disruptive it is going to be if it's approved in its current state.

20 MS TUOR: Thank you. Any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: No. That's fine. Thanks.

25 MS TUOR: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks very much.

MS TUOR: Right. Thank you very much.

30 MR KELLY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

35 MS TUOR: Our next speakers are Angela and Stephen Rogers, and I understand, Angela, you're speaking first. Thank you. You're on mute at the moment.

MS A. ROGERS: Can you hear me?

40 MS TUOR: Yes. We can hear you now. Thank you.

MS ROGERS: Okay. Good morning. My name is Angela Rogers, and I live in the Evolve building. Thank you for taking the time to listen to me. Although I object to the Hanson proposal for a number of reasons, noise, traffic congestion, pollution and
45 inconsistency with the overall green space plan for the area, I will just address two issues today, noise and the location of the concrete plant. The proposal talks about a

dedicated ship that would minimise noise. If it were minimising noise, why not have ship to shore power?

5 Secondly, the proposal fails to address the noise made by the tugs when the boats are entering and leaving the harbour. These boats are often the ones that make – that wake up the residents of Pyrmont at night. With no buildings, only water between us and the concrete plant, the noise travels very easily across the water. If anyone has ever driven past the fish markets, the noise from the existing one tower Hanson facility does very little to reassure us of the quietness of this proposal.

10 The proposal also talks about the inbuilt attenuation of our building. If the plant is running seven days a week, 24 hours a day, it is assuming that we never open our windows or doors. With the northwest aspect and the heat that it generates, this assumption is unrealistic and could not be expected of anyone. Any noise complaints to the Port Authority are treated with respect but lead to nothing. No boat or company has ever been prosecuted for a noise complaint. Somebody is – I’ve got the echo. Sorry.

20 My second point is the location. The size and the location of the concrete plant will block the view looking out and looking up towards the Anzac Bridge, a state significant site. Figure 13 – the photos taken in figure 13 of the proposal have not been taken directly in front of the area proposed for the concrete plant. The Planning Department in the past has taken great care to ensure that the views of the Anzac Bridge are not obstructed, but in this case, that seems to have been forgotten.

25 This proposal is in direct contradiction to the plans to create a green space and the reopening of the Glebe Island Bridge for public use. Who will want to cycle or walk past the concrete plant? The attempt to make the concrete plant look aesthetically pleasing with a Greenwall of shipping containers does very little to soften an area that is the size of five football fields. In conclusion, I ask the Commission to reject the application. I agree with James Kelly that Botany to me seems the most logical choice for this sort of facility and has never been explored. So thank you for your time.

35 MS TUOR: Thank you. And Stephen Rogers, you’re there?

MS ROGERS: Yes.

40 MR S. ROGERS: Commissioner, as my wife said, we reside in the Evolve building, which his at 2 Bowman Street. It is the closest residential building to the site of the proposed concrete plant, just some 100 plus metres away. We reside on the fourth – the third floor of the building, and relevant to what I have to say today, I have direct line of sight to the Glebe – the old Glebe Island Bridge, the roadway that comes out of it and what would be the site of the concrete plant. In my time today, I would like to address a matter which I think is particularly important. That matter is the compatibility or lack thereof between the proposed plant and the revitalisation of Glebe Island, White Bay and surrounding areas and the reopening of the Glebe

Island Bridge and the creation of the accessway, all of which are envisaged in the Department of Planning's own Draft Bay White – West Planning Strategy, which I will just subsequently refer to as the strategy.

- 5 In its executive summary, the department comments on page 3 that the strategy creates visions for the area, including of a mixed-use precinct with integrated port and maritime facilities, to shape an innovative new place for living, recreation and working and bring a world-class foreshore with walking and cycling activities. Page (v) of the department's assessment effectively states the plant is consistent with the strategy, as the strategy designates the site as a concrete plant. At page 11, it is stated that a key directive of the strategy is retain, manage and allow strategic port and maritime facilities to grow and evolve. On that basis, the department assesses that the plant and strategy are effectively consistent.
- 10
- 15 In my view, the plant is completely incompatible with the strategy generally and in particular with the restoration of the Glebe Island Bridge and the creation of the associated cycle and walkways to connect Pyrmont to White Bay and Glebe Island, which is described, I should say, at page 42 of the strategy as being an essential aspect of the revitalisation and a non-negotiable part of the strategy. The plant will be within metres from the Glebe Island Bridge and the accessway.
- 20

Now, returning to the assessment, firstly, it seems to suggest that the plant is compatible because the strategy – in the strategy, the area is shown as the site of a concrete plant, which is – there is no existing plant at the site depicted, nor anywhere else on Glebe Island. To me, it does not seem justified to depict the proposed concrete plant in the strategy and rely upon it, given that there is no concrete plant there, and the reality is it is a matter for the Commission to assess and approve that plan.

25

30 More importantly, compatibility also seems to come from a proposition that Glebe Island is a working port and that the establishment of the concrete plant is consistent with that. That justification, in my view, is misconceived. What is proposed is an industrial plant to produce contract – concrete. I'm sorry. It is not a port facility which has best been described as a facility for the loading and unloading of goods and for temporary of those goods. While it is envisaged that aggregate will be shipped to the wharf adjacent to the site, this does not make the plant itself a port facility simply because some materials are supplied to it.

35

Moreover, in the assessment, the department does not address at all the compatibility of the plant with other objects of the strategy, such as urban renewal, provision of greenspace and walking and cycle access. The rejuvenation of White Bay and Glebe Island area as proposed in the strategy has been described by some in the press as the next Barangaroo, and I think aptly so. One can now see Barangaroo has transformed – has been transformed into something magnificent. What is not on Barangaroo is a concrete batching plant with silos 30 metres tall.

40

45

Now to something closer to home in all respects, namely, the restoration of the Glebe Island Bridge and the creation of the walkway and cycleway from Pymont to Glebe Island and White Bay. The proposed plant will be metres from the bridge and the accessway, with its 30 metre silos towering over both. I understand the cost
5 estimates just to reinstate the bridge so as to bring it to the same state as its sister bridge, the Pymont Bay Bridge, to be in the vicinity of \$20 million. How can that expenditure be justified if the reinstated bridge is eclipsed by the concrete plant? One can only imagine how the appearance of the Pymont Bay Bridge would be detracted from by the presence of a concrete plant, yet this will be the position with
10 respect to the Glebe Island Bridge. Further, one is entitled to question the attractiveness - - -

MS TUOR: Your time – sorry to interrupt you, but your time is up. Do you need
15 much more time?

MR ROGERS: Probably 15 seconds. Just one more paragraph.

MS TUOR: Fine. Thanks.

20 MR ROGERS: Thank you. Further one is entitled to question the attractiveness of the pedestrian cycleway to users who will be required to pass within metres of the plant. Finally, could access even be allowed from a health perspective, given the dust and other emissions that will come from the plant? While various air quality assessment have been prepared in connection with the application, none takes into
25 account or otherwise addresses the health effect on users of the Glebe Island Bridge and accessway. I have no expertise in such matters but note that the air quality guidelines published by the South Australian EPA with respect to concrete batching plants state – recommend a minimum separation of 100 metres from residential and other activities. The users of the cycle and accessway will be significantly closer
30 than 100 metres.

In conclusion, I believe the strategy is a fine one with much to recommend. The next Barangaroo, as I said. It is my strong view that the concrete plant is incompatible with it and that I do not agree with the assessment of the department that it is so.
35 Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much. Any questions?

40 DR WILLIAMS: Just one quick question. Thanks - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - Annelise. Thanks, Stephen. So Angela mentioned the issue of inbuilt noise attenuation at the Evolve, and we've heard a little bit about that, but
45 no description about what's actually – that actually does involve. Could you describe what as a resident the noise levels - - -

MR ROGERS: I think what it means is – if I could do it by way of example. Like, the windows – I can't really show you a – the windows in our bedroom have latches, so the seal is quite tight. But it's effective against the – see, when the building was constructed, there was no industrial facility or the port over there wasn't utilised. So
5 it's very effective, because you've got the boats coming out of Blackwattle Bay, to minimise the noise of that.

MS ROGERS: You can still hear the

10 MR ROGERS: But as, I think, Angela said, when you have the vessels coming in now with the tugs, you know, and we get them at 4 o'clock in the morning, the noise of tugs moving vessels around, that – it's not effective to stop that at all. But it's certainly – when you have those latches down, it does block out a lot of the noise of
15 boats passing by, and that's what I understood that it was for. It was not contemplating that there would be a large-scale industrial facility on Glebe Island. It was – it's all about a working port, and that's probably what I was saying is it's a very different thing. We're moving to an industrial plant, not a working port or boats coming, you know, to and fro.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Great. Thank you. Thanks, Stephen.

MS TUOR: All right.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks.

25

MR ROGERS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Peter Ball.

30 MR P. BALL: Good morning, Commissioners. Can you hear me?

MS TUOR: Yes, we can.

MR BALL: My name is Peter Ball. I'm an architect, and I live in Jacksons
35 Landing. I moved here in 2015, inspired by the Bays Precinct Transformation Plan, its promise of urban renewal and world-class destinations for Glebe Island and White Bay. I wanted to be part of this grand vision for Sydney. At the time, Mike Baird announced that the industrial relic of the White Bay Power Station and surrounds will be transformed into a global set of high-tech jobs and innovation. Glebe Island
40 will transition from importing sand to exporting silicon. The Planning Department's website stated that the New South Wales Government's ambition for the Bays Precinct is to drive an internationally competitive economy by building world-class destinations on Sydney Harbour that will transform the city, New South Wales and
45 Australia.

But approval of the Hanson proposal would ring the death knell to our expectations, our right to healthy and peaceful enjoyment of our home and environment and the

visions of the transformation plan. Add this plan to the PAs self-approved MUF and Cement Australia's annual distribution of 1.2 million tonnes per annum – sorry for the repeat – and you have an industrial conglomerate covering most of Glebe Island. The Hanson behemoth is scaled to add one million cubic metres of concrete and one million tonnes of aggregate per annum to the materials to be trucked out of Glebe Island. Millions of tonnes, hundreds of thousands of trucks, a level of industrial intensification of a scale none of us have ever seen before in this part of Sydney, I would submit. Is this really what we want in Sydney Harbour, an area which has just transitioned from industry to one of the densest residential areas in Australia? I think not.

In this submission, I'd like to speak about the dysfunctional planning process that backgrounds the assessment. An inspiring collective of visions and objectives of the entire Bays Precinct, the transformation plan met with enthusiasm and widespread public acclaim. A competent planning response required the commencement of an overall Bays Precinct master plan to protect, enable and coordinate these visions and objectives. Had this happened, I believe the character and scale of industrialisation represented by the Hanson concrete plant and its neighbours would have been ruled out from the start as being inappropriate for this site. Sadly, the Planning Department chose to allow delayed and piecemeal planning of parts of the Bays Precinct headlined by the new Sydney Fish Market. The vacuum created by this approach has been filled by opportunistic commercial development proposals, such as this one, which now jeopardise the entire transformation plan.

The March 22 release of the Bays West Place Strategy includes the Hanson plan, despite the fact that its assessment by the DPIE had not even been concluded and the process of determination by the IPC had not even commenced at the time of release. This undermines public confidence in the planning process and arouses suspicions in relation to the concrete plant on Bank Street owned and operated by Hymix, a subsidiary of Hanson, a plant which forms part of the amalgamation of land along Bank Street for the government to sell to developers for high density development. The Hanson project does not even comply with the relevant planning documents without a massive stretch of the imagination or an equal dose of political spin.

I refer to the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan 2000, the Bays Precinct Transformation Plan 2015, the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Plan currently in an advanced stage of preparation and the recently released draft Bays West Strategy. Hanson states in EIS that it complies with the first two. I would like to explain – sorry – explain why this is not true. The Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan is the current master plan for the Bays West Precinct. In the absence of any revision to that plan, its principles for control should govern what can and cannot take place, yet they appear to have been cast aside in both the proposal and its assessment.

This plan's principles include improvement in the overall appearance of the port, a framework to ensure that development within the port achieves a high standard of urban design and urban design principles recognising the port's location adjacent to residential areas, with particular attention to the physical provision of noise control

measures. This plan provides two building zones, one for buildings of up to 10,000 square metres in floor area and 12 metre maximum height, and one for a six to seven level parking structure of up to 25 metres maximum height, nothing over 25 metres. These zones do not occur along the wharf or near either the Anzac Bridge or the old
5 Glebe Island Bridge. They are located towards the centre in accordance with the plan's objectives to maintain existing views of major landmarks and to respect urban context, a common concern in the public objections to Hanson's EIS.

The proposed location of this concrete plant is, therefore, not permitted. So why is
10 now okay? The Hanson proposal has a site area of several football fields and is higher than the carriageway of the Anzac Bridge. I don't know whether many people understand that. It doesn't comply on the issues of location, height and scale. It ignores the spirit and the provisions of this plan. Nor is it consistent with the existing working harbour character of the area. Small-scale maritime operations and
15 occasional ship berthing is the well-established character of Johnsons Bay. Primarily it's become an increasingly busy waterway servicing Rozelle Bay. There is no precedent for large-scale industrialised facilities along this side of Glebe Island. And it does not comply on noise pollution, as acknowledged in the DPIE assessment and the accompany peer noise review. The plant generated night-time noise levels would
20 be well above both EPA and master plan limits, reason alone, in my view, for refusal.

Turning to the transformation plan, Glebe Island became a state significant site after the release of the transformation plan to ensure that all future development in Bays West would comply with the plan's principles. Large-scale 24/7 industrial
25 intensification clearly does not. The use of its entire perimeter as a deepwater port is a gross distortion of the plan's objective to support a degree of maritime-related activity within an urban mixed-use precinct. A pedestrian-friendly precinct anchored by a White Bay Power Station commercial and transport hub would be unachievable through the disruption caused by thousands of truck movements per day, high impact
30 noise levels and the toxic output of the nearby concrete plant. And Hanson's dominating presence in a long-term industrial conglomeration spreading over Glebe Island and White Bay would destroy the objective of creating a world-class destination.

This plan refers to a post-2022 timeframe for commencement of works that reflects
35 its visions. This is next year. Therefore, post-2022, any development on Glebe Island must be in accordance with the visions and objectives of this plan, not post-2040, 2050 or some other future date to be arranged between Hanson and the Port Authority at their convenience. So not only is the Hanson proposal far too late. It
40 does not comply with the transformation plan's objectives and visions. It should be rejected as an inappropriate, disruptive and dangerous usage of this state significant site. Time constraints don't allow much discussion on the last two plans I mentioned.

45 MS TUOR: You've got one minute.

MR BALL: Is that the bell?

MS TUOR: You've got one minute - - -

MR BALL: Sorry.

5 MS TUOR: - - - still.

MR BALL: Apologies for running over time. I speak too slowly.

10 MS TUOR: No. Sorry. You've still got one minute, so if you can just wind up.

MR BALL: Could I prevail on the Commission to allow me a little bit more than one minute? Because I do have a little bit of subject matter to run.

15 MS TUOR: How much longer do you think you will be?

MR BALL: Probably two or three.

20 MS TUOR: No. I can't allow that long. Can you try and condense it into no more than – you've got 30 seconds, so make it about another minute and a-half. Can you try and do that?

MR BALL: Okay. Thank you.

25 MS TUOR: Yes.

30 MR BALL: Well, I was going to talk about the other two plans, and basically they relate to a strong physical connection between Blackwattle Bay and the fish markets and the new metro. But the problem with all of that is that the metro will be on the other side of the Cement Australia silos, and such public access would have to occur directly alongside one of the world's largest concrete plants and through the Cement Australia site with obvious issues on that one. I will leave that section go at this stage. Before closing, though, I would like to turn briefly to the assessment, if I may.

35 MS TUOR: Yes.

40 MR BALL: 80 per cent of 225 submissions on the EIS were objections. Only 11 per cent in support. After the response to the submissions, the percentage were even more damning at 86 objections in 93 submissions. Four years after, Hanson's submission and assessment turns up, one that reads like a rehash of Hanson's EIS and subsequent RTS. It lacks objectivity and looks as if it could have been written by the proponent. It has the accepted outdated predicted data as opposed to available measured data in an apparent tactic to water down the community's environmental concerns. If this is to achieve a desired politically predetermined positive recommendation one wonders. The DPIE assessment appears to promote the project by enabling long-term occupancy and commercial viability. Its conditions carry no
45 limit at all on the duration of Hanson's occupancy. It would be in place for at least

20 years and stifle any attempts to achieve meaningful urban renewal. Is this what the DPIE – I'm sorry. I still have a little bit to go, if I - - -

MS TUOR: All right. Another 30 seconds. Just - - -

5

MR BALL: Thank you kindly.

MS TUOR: Yes.

10 MR BALL: Is this what the DPIE assessment claims to be in the public interest? Are we seriously supposed to choke on 24/7 industrial output while we wait 20 years for the transformation to begin? The assessment process has seen a demoralising detachment from both the urban renewal objectives of the transformation plans and the democratic principle of honest engagement with the public. Public debate,
15 objective discussion and proper review have been stymied every step of the way by government intransigence. I will just skip to my final line or two in my conclusion, if I may. I believe the IPC decision on the application marks a watershed in the transformation future of the Bays West, and I call on the Independent Planning Commission to refuse this application in the public interest. Thank you,
20 Commissioners, for hearing me.

MS TUOR: Thank you. What I suggest, because you had to rush a bit towards the end, is if you want to submit what your notes – submit them to the Commission.

25 MR BALL: Okay. Can I cover that in terms of my written submission which I have not yet done or - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

30 MR BALL: Would you like me to do that separately?

MS TUOR: Whichever you prefer. You can - - -

MR BALL: Okay.

35

MS TUOR: - - - do both, if you wish. But - - -

MR BALL: No.

40 MS TUOR: Or just do it - - -

MR BALL: I will certainly - - -

MS TUOR: - - - as one document, whatever you prefer.

45

MR BALL: Okay.

MS TUOR: All right.

MR BALL: No. I will certainly expand on it in my written submission. Thank you very much for your time.

5

MS TUOR: I will just check if there's any questions.

DR WILLIAMS: No. That's fine.

10 MS TUOR: No. All right.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much.

15

MR BALL: Okay.

MS TUOR: The next speaker is Ross Stitt.

20 MR R. STITT: Good morning, and thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you.

25 MR STITT: I'm a resident of Jacksons Landing. There are numerous problems and areas in the department's assessment. I want to focus on just one of them, the horrendous visual impact of the proposal. I have got some pictures that I'd like to share. Bear with me a moment. I'm just about there. Okay. The key conclusion of the department's assessment is:

30 *The visual impacts of the proposal are acceptable.*

35 This is quite a leap, given even Hanson concedes that its proposal has major visual impact problems. Its visual impact assessment found that "high impacts on views from nearby infrastructure corridor", "high to moderate impacts on views from public open spaces along the foreshore" and "the impact on the majority of individual areas of open space will be either high or high to moderate". How does the department get from Hanson's concessions to the conclusion the visual impacts of the proposal would be acceptable?

40 There are three key issues here. The first is the appearance of the plant. There's no escaping the fact that the concrete plant would be ugly. It would be completely unsuitable for the foreshore of Sydney Harbour, one of the most beautiful harbours in the world. I've got a picture here of the proposed site. It's particularly prominent and close to the heart of Sydney and can be seen from many parts of the inner
45 harbour, including Pyrmont, Balmain, Glebe and Barangaroo. This site is viewed by thousands of Sydneysiders and visitors every day. What would the Hanson proposal mean for this beautiful area? There's the answer. Now, I realise this is a

photomontage from Hanson's EIS. I realise there have been changes, but the basic block form will still remain. How can the department contend that allowing an industrial carbuncle to disfigure this prime harbour site for the next quarter century is acceptable? The department asserts that:

5

The proposal's design and materials are consistent with the visual amenity and industrial waterfront character of the harbour and surrounding foreshores.

10 This is self-evidently incorrect. That's the current site. Now, Hanson and the department go on constantly about the Glebe Island Silos, but they are much further away from the site than, for example, the Sydney City Marine buildings. The department's only answer for this proposed eyesore is a condition requiring Hanson to arrange a wall of shipping containers stacked three high for visual screening. Seriously? What difference would those shipping containers do to that view?
15 They've also talked about vague promises of landscaping when they know full well and have known for three years that there's really no room on that site for landscaping, and yet they still continue on insisting that they will do that, as does the department.

20 Also talk of a public arts strategy as if that will make any difference to that view. There's also a jarring inconsistency between the department's conclusion in its assessment and its very recent strategic plan, the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy. The department describes the harbour as "one of the world's most treasured harbours". It seeks Pyrmont's role as an attractive waterfront tourism and
25 entertainment district supporting the global attraction of Sydney Harbour and will be "a waterfront destination showcasing the best of Sydney". Is that what that picture is showing us? There's no discussion in that strategy on the impact of having an ugly concrete plant on this fabulous harbour and foreshore promenade for the next 25 years.

30

The next issue is views towards landmarks. There are lots of regulatory and planning requirements in this regard. There's a requirement, for example, in the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan to "maintain existing views to landmarks". The department's conclusion on this requirement is "that the proposal would have no
35 adverse impacts on views to landmarks". This is patently false. It's inconsistent with Hanson's own findings of high impact. Again, on page 27 of the assessment, it states:

40 *The proposal would not significantly impact on views towards the Anzac Bridge.*

The department can't possibly reconcile this photo with those statements. Not significantly impact on views towards Anzac Bridge? The department seems to have its own alternative facts. The concrete plant would self-evidently have a disastrous
45 impact on views. The Anzac Bridge looks particularly beautiful at night. Look at that picture. Imagine for a moment that at the right-hand side there that vast concrete plant was built, lights going 24/7 every day of the year. It would destroy one of

Sydney's most beautiful views. And yet the department seems to view this as acceptable. The reality is its assessment doesn't really address the issue. Again, there's inconsistency between what the department includes here and its own Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy. I quote:

5

The head of the Pymont Peninsula is prominent when viewed from Anzac Bridge and the bridge itself provides a stunning backdrop to the area.

10 A stunning backdrop. Is that what they call a stunning backdrop? The inconsistency is staggering. Right next door – now, this is particularly interesting. Right next door to the proposed site are the Sydney City Marine buildings. You can see them to the right of the picture. Now, I've gone back and looked at the approval applications and the approvals of these buildings. There was a fundamental requirement that all those buildings be below the Anzac Bridge carriageway so as to not distract from views to
15 and from the bridge. This was all approved by the same department. Suddenly, when it comes to the Hanson plant, this has all gone out the window and we have the horrendous proposal they've got for this – large Hanson silos in particular.

20 Lastly, I want to look at views from landmarks. This is all considered in a number of places as a requirement to protect views from landmarks. The issue on this issue in the assessment – sorry – the analysis of this issue in the assessment is particularly derisory. One look at that photo tells you that obviously the views from the Anzac Bridge are going to be seriously disrupted. It will obscure large sections of view from people driving and walking across the bridge. But that's not the impression
25 given by the department's assessment. Again, it simply states that the impact would be acceptable, and in yet another example of the department's selectivity, the assessment has no independent analysis but simply relies on some Hanson photos.

30 This is one of the examples of photos you get. The only useful thing about this photo is it shows you just how intrusive the silos would be in terms of blocking out the views right up to the horizon and beyond. Now, of course, that photo was taken from a very convenient self-serving position by Hanson and repeated by the department. If you walk a few metres to the left or to the west on the Anzac Bridge, you get a very different picture. This is a photo I took this morning. That is the view from
35 large parts of the Anzac Bridge looking not towards Balmain, but towards the Harbour Bridge, the harbour and the city.

I point in particular to the near foreground where you see the Sydney City Marine Buildings. You can see why they were restricted to their height so as to not obscure
40 these views. On the department's assessment, it doesn't seem to matter that this entire view for a large part of the bridge would disappear. How can that possibly be acceptable? Once again, it would even be worse at night. That is the spectacular view that you get from large parts of the Anzac Bridge. Those are the views that were protected by the department in relation to the Sydney City Marine development.
45 For some reason, they seem to have thrown that out the window. Don't tell me that a public arts strategy is going to help that or a landscaping strategy.

If I make a suggestion. The Commissioners should go to Balmain and catch the number 442 bus into the city. As you come onto the Anzac Bridge, you will pass the statue of the Australian digger on the left. From there, you will see amazing views of the harbour and the city, views to Balmain, North Sydney, Johnsons Bay, the Harbour Bridge, Barangaroo and the CBD. Or go to Five Dock and catch the 437 or Parramatta, the 501, the 500 from Rozelle. You get the picture. Dozens and dozens of bus routes. Every day, hundreds of buses carry thousands of people across that bridge. Then there are the cars as well, the 140,000 vehicles every day, plus thousands of cyclists and pedestrians all enjoying this view. Let's be clear. This proposal would completely block those views for a large part of the bridge for thousands of people every day. How does the department conclude that that would be acceptable, that that would be in the public interest?

Once again, it's revealing to consider how the issue of views from the bridge was considered by the department in the context of the Sydney City Marine development. In that development, there was a 2015 subsequent application to add a lightbox. Once again, I've gone through and reviewed these applications. The lightbox was four metres wide and sits below the level of the carriageway. Now, there was an intense analysis of that lightbox amid concerns that it would block views to and from the bridge. There was a requirement that "built form must not present a wall of development to the public domain" and it must "maintain existing views".

I've prepared this slide. If you look at the top left-hand corner, you will see a tiny green rectangle. That is the lightbox that was built there. In 2015, the department was enormously concerned about the impact of that lightbox on views from and to the Anzac Bridge. The big rectangle, of course, is the Hanson Silos. I think you can see the picture. Those silos will be block up a vast part of the views to the city and the harbour from the Anzac Bridge. If you look two thirds of the way down the bridge there, you will see a little black circle and cross I've drawn. That's where the Hanson photo was taken, of course, looking back towards Balmain, completely ignoring the more substantive views to the city and the CBD.

That's as much as I've got time to discuss, but I'd just like to point out the final comment that the department makes in its assessment where it concludes that the impact would be acceptable because "views from the bridge would be transient and constantly changing as viewers move along the bridge". I guess what they're saying is it doesn't matter that the view will be obstructed for a large part of the bridge because you could always walk to a different part of it or drive to a different part of it. They also say "the existing views contain similar and dominant features, including the Glebe Island Silos". With respect, I don't think you could describe that view as containing similar and dominant features, including the Glebe Island Silos. In short, the assessment – and that's a misnomer to call it an assessment – is totally inadequate. It's really just a repackaging and summary of Hanson's assertions, and on no basis should that proposal be allowed to proceed. Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you. Just your photo that you've taken looking over the marina, on that last plan, can you just indicate where that was taken.

MR STITT: That one? Sorry. That one?

MS TUOR: Yes. That photo, whereabouts is that taken?

5 MR STITT: Well, if you go – basically if you go to the – well, on this – sorry. If I
can go back to – it's just – it's further – basically further west or further towards the
western part of the city on the Glebe Island Bridge. But if you go there yourself, you
will see the large part of that part of the bridge gets those views. really, from the
10 the moment you go past the statue of the Australian digger till about – walking towards
the centre of the bridge, you get those views.

MS TUOR: Thank you. Any questions?

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Thank you. Ross, I think the very early photos you were
showing us – you spent quite a long time showing it with the photomontage as well –
was that Pirrama Park, the - - -

MR STITT: That's right. Yes.

20 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR STITT: Yes.

25 MS TUOR: Okay.

MR STITT: And if you – you can – you will find, if you go to Balmain, you will
see the same view. If you go to Barangaroo, you can also see that very site. It goes
right up the harbour. You'll be able to see that concrete plant from the whole of
Barangaroo Park.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Great.

MS TUOR: All right.

35 DR WILLIAMS: That's good. Thank you.

MS TUOR: Yes.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Ross.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much.

MR STITT: Thank you very much.

45 MS TUOR: The next speaker is Nigel Champion.

MR N. CHAMPION: Hello there. My name is Nigel Champion. I speak as a concerned resident of Jacksons Landing. More specifically, I live 150 metres from the proposed multi-user facility in the Evolve building. My concerns relate very much to the health and wellbeing of residents, and these specifically relate to poor air quality, excessive noise and the artificial lighting. And I think, first of all, if we talk about the poor air quality. I accept the fact that – well, I should say that it is a working harbour and there have been ships unloading very close to where we live, and we do experience excessive dust and – but more specifically, we experience a lot of the waste that comes out of the smokestacks of the actual ships themselves, and that is a real concern.

In fact, after the ships have been there – and this is on a very infrequent basis – our whole veranda is covered in this dust and this sort of very fine waste that obviously comes out of the ships. So that is a real concern from our own health perspective and it should be a concern of the health perspective of all the residents actually in Jacksons Landing, and that is the dust and also the excessive waste that comes out of the ships' engines. And I'm talking about points that have been raised beforehand, but I'm trying to relate them very specifically.

Excessive noise. Again, if that's sort of intermittent, it's not a big issue, but when it becomes 24/7 sort of 365 days of the year, it becomes a very, very big issue, and certainly it's the noise of actually unloading the ships, and the second thing is the actual manoeuvring of the ships actually into the berthing area. And it was mentioned beforehand about the actual tugboats. I don't think that there's been any acoustic consultants that have actually measured the sound of tugboats that are very powerful – have very powerful engines. The high revs create a huge amount of noise and far beyond what would be acceptable, and I would encourage that some research is actually done in the area of these huge tugboats pushing the actual ships into alignment. And as was mentioned beforehand, well, we're supposed to have double glazed windows, but why are we there if we're going to have to have everything closed up?

Coming back to the dust, again, you know, if we – of course, if we close our doors or our sliding doors, then there's not going to be dust and fumes coming actually into our apartment, but that's not why we're here. We want to have our windows open, and we don't want to have them closed 24/7. The other issue in terms of health and wellbeing is probably the artificial lighting. When you're so close, though, it actually beams straight into the apartments, and with no ship to shore – no shore to ship power, then there's generators, again, running and servicing all those lights. So the three issues I want to actually raise – or have raised are poor air quality, excessive noise and artificial lighting, which is certainly – and there's no question about it – is going to affect the health and wellbeing of residents in Pymont. Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much. Any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: No. I'm fine. Thanks.

MS TUOR: Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

5 MS TUOR: And now we have Chris Durman.

MR C. DURMAN: Yes. Thank you, Commissioners. I am Chris Durman. I live at 2 Bowman Street, Pyrmont, very close to the proposed plan. I will confine myself to marine issue today. As part of this proposal, Hanson said they will bring in all of
10 their aggregate from Bass Point Quarry. This is a major factor for them because it will reduce truck deliveries significantly on New South Wales roads. I have my reservations as to whether they really intend to use ships, as at this stage they have made no moves to seek out appropriate ships and no move to rebuild the loading facility at Bass Point.

15

But let's suppose they do use the ships on a 24/7 basis. What are the outcomes?

Number 1, noise from ships docking at night with tugs and their generators.

Vibration from the props of the tugs. We have had tugs operating here. Light spill from the docking ships and the tugs. Marine safety for vessels passing through the
20 old Glebe Island Bridge passage. Noise from discharging aggregate, aggregate being blue metal, gravel. I very much doubt that the owners of the boats in the Superyacht Marina, the Boathouse, Sydney City Marina are likely to appreciate the cement dust on their shiny boats. We endure a vessel docking at Glebe – we endured a vessel docking at Glebe Island a few months ago. It woke my wife and I and I believe
25 many in our building. Surely we are entitled to leave our windows open at night for fresh air. And let's keep in mind that between Hanson's and the MUF, we are likely to have a vessel in port every night.

Our apartments do not have double glazing, and even if we did, it's predicted say
30 that we must keep our apartments all bottled up at night. Blue metal or aggregate will be discharged by conveyor from a vessel and dropped into an aggregate receiving bin. This is going to be noisy. Prop wash from the tugs also produces vibration in our buildings. We noticed this when we had two tugs permanently moored at Glebe Island 1, and they used to start their engines and engage their props,
35 and you could feel the vibration from the props of those tugs. When ships dock, it usually involves ships' lights illuminating the work areas of their ship and the tugs using their searchlights to do the same, as well as the wharf being illuminated. So now we not only have to require – we are required to close our doors and windows, but we also have to drop all of our blinds.

40

I inspected the newish Hanson place – plant at Greenacre, and I found the area to be surrounded – or the area surrounding the plant to have a grey dust layer all over it. I think an inspection of that facility is probably a good idea. I suspect that this will affect the marinas in the vicinity or at least the owners of the boats in those marinas.
45 These outcomes not only affect our building, but the whole of Jacksons Landing, as noise and light carry over water very effectively.

Marine safety also becomes an issue. To get a clear line of sight through the old Glebe Island Bridge passage, vessels must pass within 10 metres of any moored vessel. The Port Authority has a 30 metre standoff policy, and ships berthing at White Bay often carry advertising of a 30 metre exclusion zone. Why would they
5 enforce this in White Bay where there is no danger but choose not to enforce it at Glebe Island? There has already been one death in recent years involving this passage. The line of sight through the Old Anzac Bridge will be obliterated by the height of the silos from the cruise terminal, the cruise terminal bringing in tourists from all over the world. The line of sight seemed to be a big point in the
10 government's fish market proposal, so why is it not also here?

I do not think this development by Hanson's is correctly cited. Firstly, is it really needed to supply the future needs of cement for the CBD, or is there plenty of capacity for other – with other stakeholders? And also temporary plants seem to be
15 springing up at all major sites. I do not think this proposal should be approved. However, if it is to be approved, we need to operate on a limited basis six days a week, and I would suggest a 12 hour exclusion from operation during the night. Thank you.

20 MS TUOR: Thank you very much. Any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: No. I'll be fine. Thanks.

MS TUOR: All right. Thank you.
25

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: We're now going to have our lunch break, and we will reconvene at
30 1.20.

RECORDING SUSPENDED [12.09 pm]

35 **RECORDING RESUMED** [1.19 pm]

MS TUOR: Good afternoon and welcome back. Our next speaker is David Gordon.

40 MR GORDON: Good afternoon. My name is David Gordon. My wife, Joanne, and I are residents of the Silk building in Jacksons Landing. I wish to record my appreciation to the IPCN and to Commissioners Tuor and Williams for allowing me to speak. Let me begin by posing the question how can it be in the public interest that
45 a lease can be entered into between Hanson and the New South Wales Port Authority with no published term and with no open tender process.

5 So exactly what is public interest? Finding a definition of “public interest” is quite vexed, as can be seen in a paper presented by Chris Wheeler, former deputy New South Wales ombudsman, to the AIAL forum number 72 in March 2013, titled The Public Interest Revisited – We Know It’s Important But Do We Know What It Means?

The executive summary of the DPIE assessment states:

10 *The proposal is in the public interest as it would supply concrete in close proximity to the CBD and major infrastructure projects and support the construction industry and broader economy.*

15 The term “public interest” is not defined in the DPIE assessment report. And whilst there is an attempt to provide a rationale, it is not quantified and, I stress, measurable anticipated benefits or major savings. This rationale ignores the serious downside effects this proposal will generate. In my opinion a major driver in the leasing of part of Glebe Island to Hanson is the Port Authority’s need to maximise the revenue potential of Glebe Island. A long-term lease deal with Hanson would clearly satisfy this need.

20 The PAs position with respect to this issue was made crystal clear during a meeting in March 2019 with Mr Grant Gilfillan, the then CEO of the Port Authority. In response to a question as to why the Port Authority would not redevelop Glebe Island in line with the 2015 Bays Precinct Transformation Plan, Mr Gilfillan made the point that the PA lost a significant asset without receiving any offsetting compensation when Barangaroo was removed from the PAs portfolio of properties, hence the PA was not going to give up Glebe Island as a working port.

30 Now turning to Hanson. The Hanson proposal – SSD proposal, in my opinion, has failed to state a business case, has not identified savings, shown no cost-benefit analysis and no efficiency dividends for Sydney. We have not heard of any attempt to pass on economies of operation in cost reductions to end consumers. Hanson has made the use of shipping a major incentive to locate the batching plant on Glebe Island, claiming this would potentially remove some 65,000 truck movement from the New South Wales road network. It is worth noting that it appears Hanson has done nothing since 2014 – sorry, since the 2014 upgrade of the Bass Point Quarry to use shipping.

40 So after three-plus years and in spite of the countless hours, words and dollars spent on this proposal, including this meeting, I believe this proposal can be summed up as follows: Hanson is asking Sydney to accept the notional seven per cent reduction in trucking movements in exchange for a massively scaled polluting eyesore. This is a Faustian bargain Sydney does not need nor want. The proposal is now clearly not in keeping with what the area has become, nor with the Government’s urban renewal vision. Furthermore, I believe the centralisation of both the Hanson plant and the proposed adjoining multi-user facility is a planning mistake Sydney will live to

regret. It notionally appears to be attractive but such concentrations with no in-built contingency makes such slights vulnerable to any number of disabling events.

5 As an aside I would note the New South Wales Government to date has enjoyed the benefits of approximately \$350 million of stamp duty revenue from surrounding residents and businesses, and continues to receive millions of dollars annually from recurrent sales, yet DPIE sees little issue with the environmental and quality of life implications this facility will bring, which begs the question just what definition of public interest is DPIE using. Thank you very much.

10 MS TUOR: Thank you. Any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

15 MS TUOR: Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks very much.

MR GORDON: Thank you.

20 MS TUOR: The next speaker is David Eyre.

MR EYRE: Thank you everyone, and I apologise in advance. I'm in quite a noisy environment. I'm at the airport. I had to fit this into my schedule. So thank you and good afternoon. Can you hear me okay?

MS TUOR: Yes, we can.

MR EYRE: Excellent. My main point today is that onshore power is not out of reach for this development and dock. If China can do it, Californian and European ports can do it, well, so can Sydney. There are other and far better ways that the Port Authority can keep Glebe Island in operation as a maritime facility. Offshore power, however, must be an integral part of a sustainable development for Glebe Island that embraces the needs of community, industry and government.

35 If, however, this particular development must go ahead, and I have to say people have given excellent reasons today why it shouldn't, it is essential that onshore power is a mandatory condition of approval. Freighter engines running 24/7 while in dock create intensive particulate pollution. Particulates are a major cause of lung disease. This is the primary reason why modern ports are adopting onshore power. Noise reduction and water quality improvement are also significant benefits. It simply makes no sense to increase diesel pollution in a highly urbanised location like this.

45 The IPC is an eminent group appointed to add wisdom and an essential check to the planning process. I ask you to consider the broader context and whether this proposal is of net benefit to New South Wales and to Sydney. Sydney has striven to

improve both urban air quality and water quality in our wonderful harbour, and has driven to restore inherently disused areas. Barangaroo is evidence that ambitious integrated development of docks is possible. Something of this quality could be achieved on Glebe Island. A concrete plant would sterilise this vision.

5

The development site is flanked by new residential properties over decades of its successful urban renewal in Pyrmont, during which this southern side of the dock was seldom used and never intensively used. The dominant land use of the area has changed from industrial to residential and recreational. This part of the harbour has become a valued resource for many Sydney residents, including my family. I walk there every evening and enjoy the park. Pirrama Park is a thing, it really is, and it will be blighted by this development.

15 Consistent with this renewal strategy the New South Wales Government has previously floated plans to develop Glebe Island for mixed residential, recreational and port use for smaller ships. The Port Authority, however, is now seeking to recommission the dock for intensive 24/7 operations and a concrete plant in direct conflict with previously achieved renewable and amenity goals in the current zonings. It's simply not compliant with current policy and a significant development 20 is being used to slam through an opportunistic commercial development, in my opinion.

This is a highly intensive development that will transform the area. It's not transparent why the development must be sited and configured as proposed. 25 Temporary construction material freight and smaller freighters involved in this trade could be accommodated on the northern side of the dock and with lower and less permanent impact. There is no necessity for a major concrete plant to be located in a prime waterfront site so close to residences. Once there, it's hard to see that it will ever be removed. Further, as noted above, no provision has been made for onshore 30 power to mitigate the noise, atmospheric and water pollution from freighters. Onshore power is becoming a standard requirement in modern urban ports.

35 So what is onshore power? Onshore power enables ships at dock to use shore side electricity to power onboard electrical systems such as lighting, ventilation, communication, cargo pumps and other critical equipment while turning off their engines. These ships can be connected to onshore power supply so ship operations can proceed uninterrupted while eliminating diesel emissions resulting from auxiliary engines. The electricity comes from the local power grid for a substation at the port and is plugged into special power connectors in the shore power system on the ship. 40 Benefits include reduced noise, atmospheric and water pollution. It really is a no-brainer.

Conclusion. The proposal to approve the southern side of Glebe Island for diesel-intensive industrial use has come from left-field, is inconsistent with New South 45 Wales Government air, water and noise and urban renewal policy. The port of Sydney should be a leader in shipping emissions control. Requiring onshore power would be an historic step in this direction and could enable sustainable use of the

dock for construction freight. The concrete plant must be taken off the table. It belongs under the bridge or on some other site that is less blessed with natural amenity values. Sorry.

5 MS TUOR: You can keep talking. It's just background.

MR EYRE: Overall this proposal seems piecemeal and a flow-on from other decisions made in relation to the Wattle Bay precinct rather than something that is genuinely appropriate for Glebe Island which really is the jewel in the crown of the precinct. I hope that the panel sees fit to refuse consent for this proposal in its
10 current form. The future of Glebe Island should be determined by an exemplary integrated planning and urban design process. This could be a world-class sustainable port for small ships integrated with recreational and residential development, and with some greening of the point similar to Barangaroo.

15 The current proposal is way below what Sydney and our great harbour deserves. Finally, I do urge the panel to walk Pirrama Park and the foreshore promenade one evening to enjoy the views and atmosphere. This is a beautiful part of Sydney which will be blighted by this proposal. Please do try and protect us and Sydney from this
20 development. Thank you very much.

MS TUOR: Thank you. Just one question about the shore to ship power. Our understanding is that no dry bulk shipping uses ship - - -

25 MR EYRE: Sorry, I'm just turning up my speaker.

MS TUOR: Our understanding is that currently no dry bulk shipping uses shore to ship power at any commercial ports. Is that – but you're saying it's - - -

30 MR EYRE: That may well be the case, and this is an unusual circumstance. As you know, since Sydney Harbour was constructed and since freighters got so much bigger, there is very little shipping freight north of the Harbour Bridge. And the Port Authority has struggled to get value out of that particular port, and onshore power did come up, of course, as an option for the steamship – sorry, the passenger terminal
35 but was rejected. So the only reason it is not supplied to freighters – general freighters, tramp steamers like these, is that there is no mandate for it. And usually those freighters dock at lesser docks, docks which aren't equipped for the very expensive onshore power that major ports like California or Guangzhou have. So this would be in a way a world first. It would be equipping small freighters in a
40 highly urbanised environment for sustainable onshore power.

Now, it's important to bear in mind – I'm in the engineering field by the way, but have no vested interest in this. It's important to realise that a peak load required by these relatively small ships is relatively low. You wouldn't need many connection
45 points because there aren't many freighters at the dock at any particular time. So it's fundamentally power solutions that you would have in a major container trade. For example, if you equip Botany for onshore power, that would be a very, very

expensive exercise. Equipping this point would not be. And putting that aside, to me it's a necessary condition for putting intensive freighter activity so close to residences. I don't live in Evolve but if I did this would break my heart because they are right opposite this massive concrete plant and they're going to have ships operating 24/7 with very noisy engines.

Most of these tramp steamers have noisier engines and dirtier engines than usual. So to answer your question, yes, it would require those ships to be equipped to connect to onshore power which costs typically around \$300,000 if it's not already equipped. It would end up having a higher quality of freight operator rather than just random ships docking in. The current quality of freighters there is very low. They're rundown ships. If Sydney does really need to have construction freight at this port – and I can see a rationale for that because, you know, you've got the tunnel coming, there is a lot of conglomerate that could come into the northern side of that dock on a temporary basis. You could equip that with onshore power at relatively low-cost and make it a very sustainable operation which would be in keeping with the thrust of New South Wales Government policy to make this a sustainable state.

As it is, this proposal, it's just retrograde. I understand the Port Authority needs to increase its revenue. If this is state significant development the revenue losses caused by Barangaroo, etcetera, should be replaced by a government grant to top up the Port Authority so it can continue to operate against its KPIs and in a genuinely sustainable way, instead of putting this blight on a beautiful harbour. A long answer to your question, I'm sorry.

MS TUOR: That's all right. Thank you very much. Enjoy your flight.

MR EYRE: Thank you. Bye.

MS TUOR: Our next speaker is Martin McAvenna. I'm not sure if I've pronounced that correctly.

MR McAVENNA: Thank you, Commissioner. You did indeed.

MS TUOR: Thank you.

MR McAVENNA: And good afternoon everybody. I am Martin McAvenna. We live in Evolve. We're residents of Pymont. We have a clear line of sight to Glebe Island and the planned locations of the Hanson plant, multi-user facility and of course the existing Cement Australia silos. It's panoramic. So I speak as a very concerned local resident. I don't purport to represent other residents in my building. But I also speak as a resident of the broader Sydney community because Hanson is about much more than Pymont. There is a Hanson effect which is relevant to the entire Sydney Harbour, and this city's self-perception. It's almost our self-obsession with describing ourselves as the finest harbour in the world.

The Hanson effect, the consequences of DPIE approval, and the failure to apply rigorous enforceable controls on operations is a multiplier effect: noise; light pollution; marine pollution; visual pollution; atmospheric pollution, for example, because the Sydney basin is a natural receptacle for atmospheric pollution to linger
5 for days at a time, for example when there is fire haze about. After Hanson, there will be new industrial trucks. Hanson's figures allow, in their own words, 182 trucks "every hour of the day" and I calculate that at 4300 trucks per day in the first iteration. After the interchange is completed, it has been confirmed that the truck
10 number will increase. This will inevitably cause a substantial increase in exhaust and particulate pollution which will be dumped in and around the Pyrmont, Balmain, Glebe area.

Now, there is a longstanding broader community goal and desirability to reduce road traffic generally. It's a kind of a go-to expression for environmental credentials. The
15 suggested traffic reduction across Greater Sydney will exact a penalty from Pyrmont and surrounds, concentrating the pollutants from all the industrialisation around and one of the most densely populated suburbs in Australia. In his submission to the Westconnex parliamentary inquiry in August 2018, Dr Ray Nassar detailed the cumulative health effects of exposure to pollution which are well-established,
20 ranging from asthma to strokes to dementia.

The next Hanson effect is the additional industrial shipping. This will exacerbate the marine choke point which is the passageway, the narrow passageway through the old Glebe Island Bridge. Estimates are presently 240 round trip visits a year for Hanson
25 alone. It sounds, from what I hear them say, that they're going to do their best to source quieter shipping. Until then there is not the capacity to utilise onshore power. Instead there will be continuous burning of bunker fuel, 24 hours. The Hanson effect from its own activities and the industrial activities that follow will multiply
30 atmospheric pollution.

I don't understand the inconsistencies between the original master plan of 2000 and the subsequent transformation plan, the precinct plan and the latest Bays West strategic plan. They're all inconsistent. They all include the self-congratulatory
35 adjectives as usual, "world-leading", "quality of life", "community consultation", and they will be undone by the Hanson effect. A ferry ride to the really splendid looking new fish market, the view from the cruise ships at White Bay, when they return, dominated by the largest concrete batching plant in the southern hemisphere.

In my opinion the industrialisation of Glebe Island makes no sense unless it is
40 viewed through an intensive commercial lens. The community consequences are treated as an inconvenient afterthought. I do wonder if a similar scale concrete plant has been approved and operational anywhere in the world, let's say, the last 10/15 years, next to an inner city watercourse, fish market, 170 metres from residential
45 apartments. Why are we doing this? Why did the working harbour descriptor change to "industrial harbour". It took imagination and political courage to transform the tram sheds into the Opera House, and the Hungry Mile to Barangaroo.

It required imagination in 2015 to propose the high tech-hub on Glebe Island. It took zero imagination to turn Glebe Island into an industrial plant by the water.

5 The Hanson project demonstrates that the original decision-makers know the price of everything and the value of nothing. Local residents and the broader community, in Sydney in particular, will pay the penalty of an effectively self-regulated Hanson for at least 25 years. Thank you.

10 MS TUOR: Thank you. Thank you very much.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: The next speaker is Maria Brak. Sorry, you're on mute.

15 MS BRAK: Good afternoon again. I intend to talk about open spaces and fresh air. I object to the location of the proposed Hanson facility on Glebe Island. An alternative location further to the north-east of the existing heritage listed silos and closer to Cement Australia's terminal, a Hanson partner, on Glebe Island would reduce the visual and acoustic impact. The local was proposed by the City of Sydney
20 Council and considered a suggested alternative option 2 by the Port Authority.

Cement Australia has made application to permanently increase the total amount of cement material from 600 tonnes to 1.2 million tonnes. I live in a multistorey residential property, the frontage to Waterfront Park, Johnstons Bay and Glebe
25 Island. My bedrooms, living room and balcony are north facing, 175 metres from the proposed facility. Bowman Street was identified by AECOM consultants for both Hanson and the Port Authority's MUF as the worst affected resident receiver within the noise and in visual impact

30 Waterfront Park has splendid uninterrupted views of the Anzac Bridge and views to Harbour Bridge, a playground featuring equipment young children, barbeque and picnic facilities and is a popular dog off leash park, the Blackmores Sydney Running Festival, the Seven Bridges Sydney loop trail attracts thousands of participants that go via Waterfront Park. Popular with walkers, cyclists of all ages
35 and a short walk to the Sydney Fish Market, a favourite spot for recreational fishing., Wulugul Walk, Barangaroo with uninterrupted views of the Anzac Bridge and Glebe Island bridges. One can meander via Pyrmont Bridge across Cockle Bay, Darling Harbour, to Pyrmont Bay Park on to Pirrama and Waterfront Park all the way to the iconic Anzac Bridge.

40 Why compromise the scenery by placing a cement aggregate factory 18 metres from the water's edge. Not a substantial visual to Waterfront Park and the nearest residences. The pandemic has shifted people's perception of the importance of open spaces and The proposal is not predicted to comply with relevant noise criteria
45 for all periods, day, evening and night. The proposal would result in exceedances of the relevant noise criteria at the nearest residence.

It is claimed by the proponent's consultant, AECOM, that buildings at Jacksons Landing will approve the construction in proximity to the port. In approving the development the authority considered it appropriate to requirement treatment of the buildings to achieve specific internal noise levels with the doors and windows
5 closed. The statement is not very viable. The very sort of people keeping their windows and balcony doors tight shut, an airtight apartment 24/7, makes me explode in anger. Lack of fresh air to the brain can result in fatigue, drowsiness and dullness of mind. Proper ventilation energy efficient, safe and healthy ventilation is an important factor in preventing COVID 19 from spreading.

10 Health authorities experts and worried how the coronavirus can accumulate Balconies provide access to the outside environment as well as fresh air and daylight, a most desirable part of an apartment complex.

15 MS TUOR: I will just – sorry, I will just interrupt you there. You have gone over time, so have you got much more to say?

MS BRAK: I'm just finishing

20 MS TUOR: Yes. Just finish it up now. Thank you.

MS BRAK: The pandemic has shifted people's perception of the importance of open doors and fresh air.

25 MS TUOR: Thank you very much. Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

30 MS TUOR: Apparently we're having some technical difficulties with the sound so we're just going to have to take a short break.

RECORDING SUSPENDED [1.45 pm]

35 **RECORDING RESUMED** [1.48 pm]

40 MS TUOR: Sorry to keep you waiting. Our next speaker is Robert Loader.

MR R. LOADER: Well, good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to address this meeting. I'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land under discussion and the lands on which we meet today. My name's Robert Loader and for the past 11 years I've been a resident of the Evolve building in Jacksons
45 Landing directly opposite the proposed aggregate handling facility. So I clearly have a vested interested in the proposed changes to the development of Glebe Island and a

first-hand experience of the potential problems they pose. Speaking this late in the day, forgive me if I reiterate some of the points made by previous speakers.

5 I believe the proposals can be summed up in two words, waste and betrayal. Waste, because this is one of the last absolute waterfront sites in Sydney with views over the bay to the Harbour Bridge. To consign it to an industrial site with an enormous shed and concrete batching plant operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week and a completely wasted opportunity. Naturally, the light, dust, noise and particulate pollution is of grave concern, as is the impact that the dramatically increased ship
10 traffic will have on the delicate marine environment in this narrow passage approaching the Glebe Island Bridge. Near collisions with other craft are already an issue at the current low usage and I'll share my screen now to try and show you what I'm talking about. Okay. Can you see that?

15 MS TUOR: Not yet.

MR LOADER: Is that being shared now?

MS TUOR: Not yet, no. We can't see it.
20

MR LOADER: Sorry. I'll come back and check the problems.

MS TUOR: Yes, we can see it now.

25 MR LOADER: Okay. So if we just look at this, this is a typical ship arrival. And you'll see when I roll it, the chaos that's going to ensue. The party boat had to break dramatically to get out of the way. You can see the turbulence in the water from the tugs, and the queue of – of the other boats trying to get through Glebe Island. And the other point that I'd make is that the proposed ships, because of the location of the
30 plant, will be quite a bit further to the left of this picture than – than what you see there. The other thing that I'd like to show you I took just a few minutes ago while I was waiting to come on, and that's this. This just – this is just a ferry manoeuvring in front of where these ships will arrive.

35 And you can hear the – the noise from it and you can begin to see the emission from its smoke stack. And bear in mind, these ships are going to be moored there 24/7 with their engines running and all that spewing over the – the – the – the surrounding community. So just bear with me while I get out of this. So – sorry. The - - -

40 MS TUOR: I think you've still got your video on. That's it. Thank you.

MR LOADER: Okay. Now, I say betrayal, because this proposal runs in complete contravention of the Glebe Island Master Plan 2000, which was put in place over 20 years ago, and upon which the majority of the residents of Jacksons Landing made
45 their purchase decisions when buying their apartments. The master plan and subsequent transformation precinct plans were far-sighted, grasping the opportunity afforded by Glebe Island with both hands. They proposed a low-rise tech hub,

complete with transport links to both the light and heavy rail networks and a range of parks and recreation facilities which provide much-needed high-end employment opportunities, while greatly enhancing the public amenity of the area.

5 This would generate many more than the 900 construction jobs and 67 ongoing jobs mentioned by the applicant. All these transition objectives are a fantasy if the Hanson proposal succeeds. The whole thrust of the transition of the Bays Precinct to a thriving residential and recreational area will be lost. We understand the New South Wales Government is now proposing a tech hub at the site of the White Bay
10 Power Station, which considering the history of that site, is bound to be met with strong community opposition. Why waste Glebe Island, when a tech hub could be constructed there as originally proposed, a development which would be heartily endorsed by the community?

15 If this proposal proceeds, no high-tech companies will be interested in a power station site anyway, because it will be very badly impacted by the noisy, polluting concrete plant right next door. The prevailing winds will blow dust and pollution all over White Bay and the ANZAC Bridge on a permanent basis. It's by no means certain that the Glebe Island platform will support the enormous weight millions
20 of tons of the aggregate handling facility. The current platform was a rough concreting job conducted by the US Army in World War II as a staging post for embarking troops and equipment. Can the IPC please release the results of the sample core drilling which was conducted on the island?

25 MS TUOR: I'll just interrupt you there, because you're over time.

MR LOADER: Okay.

30 MS TUOR: I've allowed you to go a bit longer, because of the delays with your screen sharing. Do you need much

MR LOADER: I can wrap it up in 30 – in two seconds.

35 MS TUOR: Two seconds. Okay.

MR LOADER: When the community met with representatives from Hanson and asked why they couldn't simply increase production at their existing concrete plant at Alexandria and the Hymix plant, the best they could come up with was, "Because it's not convenient." They have now tried to argue that this facility is vital to the future
40 development of Sydney, but this is an extremely poor reason to waste the wonderful opportunity offered by Glebe Island and betray the trust and rightful expectations of the community. Why not enhance our beautiful harbour with the proposed tech hub surrounded by parks and gardens, rather than turn Glebe Island into an unsightly, dirty, noisy and polluting industrial waste land. I urge the IPC to strongly reject the
45 proposal. Thank you for your] opportunity to address the commission.

MS TUOR: Thank you. Any questions, Peter?

DR WILLIAMS: No, I'll be fine. Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Alexander Ostermayer.
You're on mute.

5

MR A. OSTERMAYER: Commissioner, can you hear me this time?

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes, we can now.

10 MR OSTERMAYER: Thank you, commissioners. My name is Alex Ostermayer.
I'm a resident of Jacksons Landing, although I don't live in Evolve. My apartment
overlooks, from the 11th floor of the building in which I live, the Glebe Island site.
So from my apartment from the balcony to the north walking down through the
15 apartment, I have continual views of the Glebe Island site – Glebe Island and the site
of the proposed Hanson development and the multiuser facility that's authority
wishes to construct. My observations are going to be personal in that I will tell you
how it's going to affect me personally in terms of where I and my wife live.

20 We've moved to Jacksons Landing in 2014, when on the site there was – I think they
were in the process of constructing the temporary convention and exhibition centre
while the Exhibition and Convention Centre at Darling Harbour was being rebuilt.
And then was there, I think, until about 2017, when the facility – or – sorry – two
thousand and – yes, about 2017 when the facility opened at Darling Harbour. And
25 since then the Glebe Island facility has been used intermittently, apart from the
Sydney cement works area, where ships come and go, delivering cement to the silos
that are heritage listed. Has been used very intermittently for ad hoc shipping
movements.

30 My recollection would be that on a count there would be four or five shipping
movements to the island by Sydney Port Authority ships delivering dry-bulk goods.
The island is also used or – in terms of the area that I look upon that's closest to me –
for things like every Christmas we get Mr Foti and his fireworks team come along
and fill the barges for the Sydney fireworks on New Year's Eve. A couple of months
ago, we had the construction of the giant chandelier that was used in the production
35 of La Traviata by Opera Australia and that was towed off to the Botanical Gardens
where that production was held in the open. And parts of the Glebe Island area to the
north, I think, were used for taking material from Barangaroo and the Metro tunnels
that were being built for Metro Rail, shipping them across the harbour to here to be
trucked out from here.

40

As I say, I've got an uninterrupted view of it. My lounge room looks down upon it.
My dining room looks down upon it. My kitchen looks down upon it and two of my
bedrooms look down upon it. The effect it's going to have on me is that because of
the issues that have already been raised all of the other speakers very eloquently –
45 namely noise, dust, lighting and – although lighting is an issue that seems to have
been neglected in all of this to some extent – I'm going to have to change my
lifestyle. One of the joys of living where I do is that because of the prevailing

breezes that come from the east, I can leave my windows open, even on the hottest of days, and not turn on the air conditioning.

5 It means that I have cross ventilation flow through my whole apartment. What's
going to happen is that because of this facility and it's detrimental environmental
impacts, I'm going to have to close the windows. Now, there have been talk about,
the building or at least Evolve has noise attenuating facilities in there, because of the
way it was disrupted. I don't know whether my building has or not. I'm a bit further
10 away. Time flies quickly. So it's going to have a detrimental impact upon me in that
regard. As I said, one of the issues which I have, which hasn't been talked about to
any great extent, is light emission and the movement of trucks.

15 I've searched the material to find out how the trucks are going to manoeuvre round
Glebe Island, because, from where I sit, I'll be looking at their headlights. I could
find no plans at all showing how the trucks come – come down James Craig Road,
down the slope and come out at – near the silos for the cement works and then wend
their way across the island to the concrete batching plant. It's – it's – it's a concern.
No one's talked about that. It doesn't feature in any of the documents that I've seen.
20 It's going to be impact, because one of the main noise pollutants, according to
Hanson itself, is the movement of trucks. We've been concentrating on the
movement of trucks on major roads, but no one's talked about the movement of
trucks on Glebe Island and the internal movements.

25 I can't find the plans for it. The commission has asked Hanson in terms of how the
trucks are going to be loaded from the aggregate site loads. I – I don't think a clear
answer was given. I – I can't work it out. I don't know whether the commission has
understood the answer. Is it in an enclosed building? Is it in a – in an enclosed
building? When I look at diagram or figure 8, I think it is, in the environment – the
assessment by the department, it shows hoppers outside the building. That's – that
30 would be my interpretation of it. Similarly, in terms of the lighting situation, the
department in this assessment has dealt with it very glibly.

35 What it says is the department knows that the site has existing flood lights and
considers that it sits well within a well-lit – a well-lit context with existing flood
lights installed to adjoined sites. Well - - -

MS TUOR: I'm just going to have to interrupt you - - -

40 MR OSTERMAYER:

MS TUOR: Sorry. I'm going to have to interrupt you there, because you are a
minute over. Are you winding up now?

45 MR OSTERMAYER: I am. Just this point in relation to lighting.

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR OSTERMAYER: And that is that the existing flood lights on Glebe Island Bridge, I think, would have been turned on about three times in the time that I've lived here in the past seven years. So to say that because there are flood lights installed on Glebe Island at the moment we residents are used to having them
5 switched on is absolute nonsense. There needs to be a very well-defined condition in – if the approval is given in relation to lighting and in relation to internal truck movements, which going to be a truck moving on this site – most probably once every 20 seconds, on and off the site, given the number of trucks that are going to be moving. Thank you, commissioners.

10 MS TUOR: Thank you very much. Any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: Just one point of clarification. Sorry, Alex. Towards the beginning, you mentioned that the numbers of vessels moving on the site at the
15 moment is fairly – I think you said ad hoc or infrequent. And you mentioned four to five Port Authority vehicles – vessels. Sorry. Was that per annum or - - -

MR OSTERMAYER: That – that – that would – yes. I haven't been keeping count. I haven't been keeping score, but my – from my observations, the – it's used by
20 vessels currently where the multiuser facility is going to be stored. You would have about four or five vessels coming a year, per annum.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR OSTERMAYER: And – and that – that – that's the extent of it. They come there, they dump their material, it's loaded by forklifts onto trucks and it moves out. And that – that's – that's the extent of use that the – this part, this eastern part of Glebe Island is being put to use – is being put to. The other side, where the cement work – sorry – the – the silos are, the high – the current silos are, are used more
30 frequently by shipping, but the – they're further away for my residence, so they don't impact upon me to such a great extent. Although, for example, last night, there was a larger ship there and – and there was quite a bit of – light pollution coming from it.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thanks.
35

MS TUOR: Thank you very much. Thanks.

MR OSTERMAYER: You're welcome.

40 MS TUOR: The next speaker is Robert McIntosh.

MR R. McINTOSH: Yes. Thank you. Now, I'm a resident of the Elizabeth on Jacksons Landing. I just want to state my objection in principle and in detail to the proposed development. I, like others, are concerned about the noise, the air quality,
45 traffic, views and social and economic impacts. Quite – I appreciate the need for a concrete batching plant in Sydney and, indeed, on the harbour and the lack of suitable sites. However, I find it disingenuous that the representatives of Hanson in a

recent meeting with yourselves, to refer to the project efficiency in an – in an environmentally sustainable way, when the manufacture of cement and concrete is one of the major contributors to CO2 emissions.

5 I – I note there's no discussion as to whether this is the optimal site for use of this kind and whether the location on the other side of the existing silos, as suggested by the city council, could not have been preferable. To place a development of this type so close to an existing high-density residential area seems to immediately create a potential for conflict. If located north of the silos, these distances to the nearest
10 residences are doubled. And – and there's – as we've talked before, it's just been mentioned by Alex about the movement of ships on that site, it is far more common anyway. There are 178 objections to this proposal when first suggested, and I support the Jacksons Landing Coalition statements and believe there are many who have been silent on this, because there's a great deal of cynicism relating to the
15 process. Not the commissioners or the IPC, but following the consent of the multiuser facility next door.

A multiuser facility was the subject of a very different planning process, but the lack of controls, such as permitting 24/7 use of the site, should not set a precedent of this
20 proposal. My – my understanding is that the existing Hanson and Hymix facilities don't operate on a 24-an-hour basis, so why – this seems to be a substantial increase in their hours of use. This intensification of use flows through to the entire proposal. Historically, this was a working port. In the last 15 years, the level of use has dropped significantly and there has certainly only be intermittent use of Glebe Island
25 as a port. Even so, every a boat's docked, there have been complaints, but no action's taken. But I do appreciate this is a working port, but mainly for smaller vessels at a much lower level of use. I've read the various records of the IPC website and note the difficulties of having ships use an onshore electrical power.

30 For the Hanson representative to say at a recent meeting with the IPC that, quote:

None of the potential vessels need this type of power supply and it doesn't currently exist on Glebe Island –

35 is quite frankly irrelevant and potentially misleading. If this can be done by the navy at Garden Island, then this is entirely feasible here. The New South Wales Port Authority in its recent meeting with the IPC said it wished this area to become a world-class and exemplar integrated port. If so, why not follow the example of the navy and cruise ships and insist on the use of onshore power, particularly at night, to
40 reduce noise and air pollution? On the traffic – on the issue of traffic movement, there is this statement by the Hanson representative and Ethos Urban report of March two thousand and – 2018:

45 *...that the proposal will remove 65,000 truck movements from the city road networks per annum.*

I can't find any supporting material for this calculation. As far as I know, most of the cement and aggregate currently used for the existing sites is delivered by ship, rather than 178 trucks a day that this suggests are currently arriving in the Glebe Pymont area. It has been stated by one of the objectors that – that Enfield Council
5 has issued many breach notices to Hanson for noise and dust offences. This does suggest that the company will – you know, does it suggest the company will comply with proposed conditions on this site? Therefore, any controls need to be very tight and strongly enforced. So in summary, I reiterate my objection to the development in terms of scale and location.

10 If, as I suspect, this is granted approval, I suggest there are very stringent conditions based on the construction and use to the site, given its proximity to existing residential areas. This should include reduced work hours, the provision of electrical power to ships and stringent controls on the emission of sulphur from the ships and
15 enforcement of those conditions. Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much.

20

DR WILLIAMS: I'm right, thanks.

MS TUOR: You all right?

25 DR WILLIAMS: I think so.

MS TUOR: Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

30

MS TUOR: The next speaker is David Stillman.

MR D. STILLMAN: Good afternoon. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. My wife and I are residents of the Evolve building in Bowman Street, Pymont, which is
35 the nearest building to Glebe Island on the Pymont side and is about 150 to 170 metres away. We moved here in January 2013. And that time and for about the previous three years, there were only about four to six large ships per year into and out of the Pymont side of Glebe Island. That has remained the situation to this day, so that answers the question. It's about four to six per year. At the time we moved
40 here, we were aware of government plans to transform and urbanise the Bays Precinct, culminating in the release of the Bays Precinct Transformation Plan in October 2015, but with an expectation that part of Glebe Island would remain a working port.

45 Also during the last 12 years or so, all of the high-rise residential buildings at the western end of Jacksons Landing were built, with a corresponding influx of new residents. We have been made aware through the recent planning processes that

these buildings were fitted with extra – with some extra noise mitigation measures, as some protection against port noise, with the DPIE has highlighted in its project assessment. It is very important to note that the proposed Hanson concrete plant is, in fact, the manufacturing facility and well outside the scope of what could be
5 considered normal working port activities. The addition of such a facility on Glebe Island would be a major deviation from historical activity on Glebe Island for the last 100 years and is totally inconsistent with other plans for the area, like the fish market, the rejuvenation of the White Bay Power Station, the new White Bay Metro Station and the proposal to restore the Glebe Island Bridge.

10 There are many issues I could talk about regarding the proposed Hanson Concrete plant, but I've chosen to focus on what I believe to be the biggest issue, and that is ship noise. When I talk about ship noise – ship noise, I also include vibration, which is another important factor which is sometimes underestimated. Ship noise can come
15 from a number of sources, some intermittent and some continuous. Intermittent noise is the worst, because it is random and unexpected, particularly at night. Intermittent noise includes (1) ships arriving and leaving with engines revving, (2) tugs assisting ships to arrive and leave, (3) opening and closing of ships' hatches, and (4) maintenance of the ship while it is in port.

20 Continuous noise is mainly the running of the ship's generators and engines whilst in port, which can also be variable. I've already stated that the norm for large ships on the Pyrmont side of Glebe Island for more than a decade has been four to six per year. However, none of us envisaged the proposed huge increase in shipping
25 frequency as a result of new projects, one of which is the proposed Hanson Concrete plant. The Hanson Concrete plant will host about 120 ships per year for importing in aggregate. The Port Authority's multiuse facility will host about 80 ships per year for importing sand. And there is also a plan to double the throughput of the cement silos on the Balmain side of Glebe Island from about 600,000 tonnes per year to 1.2
30 million tonnes per year, which will also increase ship movements.

So the number of vessels arriving at the Pyrmont side of Glebe Island will change from four to six per year to about four per week. It is hard to understand how that number could even be scheduled and accommodated. In response to widespread
35 community concerns, the Port Authority launched a draft port noise policy last year and implemented it on 1 January this year after receiving feedback from a range of interested parties, including residents. It's a highly complex document, but the bottom line is the noise limits are far too generous to the ships, penalties are not abiding – penalties for not abiding by the policy are far too lenient and take too long
40 to implement and their experience with their Port Authority is that they lack the power and/or the desire to make meaningful changes to ship noise.

The DPIE's main response to the noise issue is to – is to suggest that noise mitigation – is to suggest that the noise mitigation measures built into our apartment buildings
45 will solve the problem. Firstly, that implies that they are expecting us to have our doors and windows shut 24/7, which is entirely unreasonable. No one in their right mind would have purchased in this area under those conditions. Secondly, we know

from lived experience that even with windows and doors shut – and this is a critical point – that the noise and vibration from some ships and tugs penetrates into the apartment and causes sleep generation.

5 There are a number of potential solutions. Increase noise mitigation on hundreds of
apartments, which would be costly and impractical. Impose a night-time curfew on
ship movements and unloading, but that would only solve part of the issue and not
10 solve a range of other issue with the project. And, (3), build the – the Hanson
Concrete plant elsewhere, for example, the Sydney City Council proposal, or use
onsite production of concrete for large construction sites, which was the case at
Barangaroo. I know I'm running out of time. In conclusion, I have only dealt with
ship noise, but there are many other issues with the Hanson proposal, like the lack of
15 consistency with development plans for the rest of the area; truck congestion in an
already very busy area; marine congestion in already busy waterways; visual
impact, particularly on the ANZAC Bridge and views from it; air pollution and the
impact of lights from ships, trucks and the manufacturing plant itself. Thank you
very much for the opportunity to speak. I do appreciate it.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much.
20

DR WILLIAMS: I'm fine, thanks.

MS TUOR: Thank you.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: No questions. The next speaker, Neild McIntosh.

MR N. McINTOSH: Good afternoon, commissioners. Can you hear me okay?
30

MS TUOR: Yes, we can.

MR McINTOSH: Okay, good. My name is Neild McIntosh and I'm a resident of
the Jacksons Landing estate at Pyrmont. Our apartment looks across Bowman Street
35 to Glebe Island and our bedroom windows are all directly exposed to the proposed
concrete plant. Our balcony faces Glebe Island as well. We object to this concrete
plant proposal. It will severely damage our quality of life for the next 15 to 20 years,
which, for all intents and purposes, is the rest of our lives. We moved to Pyrmont
eight and a half years ago. Over the last 20 years, more than two and a half thousand
40 people have also moved into the Jacksons Landing development.

Many of these people, like us, sold their family home in the suburbs and used the
proceeds to move into a smaller residence, closer to the Sydney. Pretty much what
all levels of government are encouraging people of our age to do. This was and is a
45 big strategic decision for many of us and one that we did not take lightly. I read
every document I could find about the plans for the Bays Precinct. Yes, I – yes, I
expecting a working harbour, but I did not expect a concrete manufacturing plant. I

also expected that, like us, a working harbour would mostly rest at night. Bays Precinct Transformation Plan of 2015 was a welcome statement to reinforce the previous Bays Precinct plans and community consultations. Glebe Island it's said, and I quote:

5

An opportunity to support blue economic activities of the port and maritime industries, potentially combining with a technical and innovation campus.

10 So six years ago, no mention of a concrete plant. To state the obvious, a concrete manufacturing plant is not a maritime industry. Then out of the blue in January 2018 came the proposal from the Port Authority to build a multiuser facility on Glebe Island to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week with over 80 ship arrivals per annum and more than 1000 truck movements per day. When we thought things could not get worse, the Hanson Concrete plant proposal arrived soon after and
15 tallying over 150 ship arrivals per annum and a staggering 240 truck movements per hour. Combined impact means 230 ships arriving and departing each year.

Now, that's four to five ships per week compared to four to five ships per annum at the moment. It will be disastrous for us and extremely dangerous for any craft using
20 the waterway. And the trucks. We could have close to 6000 truck movements on days where both facilities are operating. And that's more than four trucks per minute. And that's ridiculous. In the assessment report that you have been provided, it makes reference to the draft Bays West Place Strategy and states that the concrete plant is consistent with this draft plan. Well, of course it is, because the draft plan
25 was only released in March 2021, three years after the Hanson proposal.

The draft plan has been written to incorporate the concrete plant. We all feel betrayed here. You see, state governments can change their strategic plans to suit the demands of the moment. In this case, where to relocate two concrete plants. The
30 2015 Transformation Plan has itself been transformed into the draft 2021 Place Strategy Plan. It is not so simple for us to change our strategic plans. We made our big strategic decision nine years ago to leave our house and our suburb, a huge, life changing move. We believe that as the government had redeveloped this polluted industrial site at Pyrmont to category for two and a half thousand residents that it
35 would not subsequently permit developments that would ruin our lives.

We are all shocked by the extent of this betrayal. The assessment report pretty much gives Hanson all that they have asked for. Commissioners, on our half, please, you must ask why. For – for example, its stated that the Hanson ships are able to unload
40 in 12 hours. So why wouldn't the DPIE insist that these ships must arrive, unload and depart again on – in daytime hours, say between 7 am and 9 pm? And the operating hours, I cannot find another Hanson plant in the country that operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. They all have limited hours and none work on Sunday. So – so why does Hanson claim this Glebe Island plant is not viable if it
45 can't operate any time of the day or night?

That sounds like an ambit claim to me and I'm sure Hanson can't believe they may get away with it. Please reject this proposal. If you can't reject it, then don't let them operate at night. Please let us get some sleep. Thank you.

5 MS TUOR: Thank you. Any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: I'm right. Thank you.

MS TUOR: All right, thank you.

10

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

MS TUOR: So we're now going to take an afternoon break and we'll reconvene at 2.35.

15

RECORDING SUSPENDED

[2.20 pm]

20

RECORDING RESUMED

[2.36pm]

MS TUOR: Good afternoon and welcome back. Our next speaker is Gavin Waldin.

25

MR G. WALDIN: Thank you for this opportunity. I submit that a heavy industrial facility such as this should be sited at an area appropriate for that use, those within an industrial precinct such as Port Botany. It shouldn't be allowed in a densely populated predominantly residential area. This is our harbour. It's a drawcard for domestic and international visitors and the batching plant if approved will severely impact both visually and acoustically the enjoyment and use of the foreshore walk areas that look at it and impact the potential for extension of that walk to link to the other walks available in Balmain. This area also houses the overseas passenger terminal. A batching plant is hardly an appropriate welcome to international visitors. The area is also intended for major revitalisation as a mixed use precinct. It's no longer appropriate for heavy industrial uses and the extensive shipping movement that would come with it.

30

35

Adopting the label a working harbour has to balance with what's occurred in the area already. Previous and, in fact, current planning strategies have led to major residential intensification in the area and together Pyrmont, Glebe, Roselle and Balmain represent some of the most dense residential areas of Sydney. Allowing this use will have a dramatic and severely detrimental impact on the area, the foreshore and the liveability of all precincts that are close to the harbour. The size and scale of the proposal is massive. The noise impact reviewed and considered in the information package only appear to consider the noise from the plant itself and the vehicle movements. No consideration has been given to the noise created by the ships themselves and their movements within the harbour or when docked. There is

40

45

already significant noise from existing harbour activity but not of the duration and intensity that this would create.

5 We know that the noise impacts would occur from Balmain Peninsula, were our
house is located, has not even been investigated or considered yet we know we're
already impacted by the noise from ships using Glebe Island both during the day and
night. It's not reasonable to exacerbate this further by a heavy industrial use that will
create noise from ships and the plant 24 hours a day, seven days a week with no
10 respite at all. The relentless impact of the cumulative noise that will come from the
plant, the ships and trucks must be considered in deciding whether to approve the
plant. Please remember that the proposal is for the introduction of a new use, not a
continuation of an existing one. I am concerned about the precedent that this may set
for more heavy industrial development seeking to come in into the working harbour
15 part of the bay, an area that has been gentrified over the past 15 years to a significant
degree with house prices to match.

People have bought into the areas around the harbour on the basis of its regeneration
away from an industrial port. It's not reasonable to now change the goalposts. I ask
20 you not to approve this application. The batching use already exists on the fish
market site now and could remain there for the foreseeable until that major
redevelopment is completed. This timeframe is also likely to cover much of the time
required for the construction of the major infrastructure works for State Government
that are used to try and justify the plant. These include WestConnex M4-M5 Link
25 Rozell Interchange Harbour Tunnell, Warringah Freeway Upgrade and the new
metro station. Based on table 1 in the report, the timeframes for these projects
appears to be around five years or so. The redevelopment of the fish market site will
take longer than that and therefore batching plants next to the existing one is a
reasonable outcome if more capacity is required.

30 However, if the PAC is considering approval of this development and we hope to
God you're not, then there must be every endeavour made to ensure that there are no
major impacts. Firstly, the lease should be heavily time limited. That is the duration
to be no more than five years to complete the infrastructure work and then it should
be required to demolished and the site remediated. There should be enforceable
35 conditions of consent that require major acoustic mitigation not only to the plant
itself and the vehicle movements but also to the ships that are allowed to use those
berths, both for the multipurpose facility and the concrete batching plant. This must
include all the noise criteria and the requirement that the berths can only be used by
the quieter vessels discussed in the report and that these vessels should be fitted with
40 the capacity for ship to shore power.

There should also be as part of any development the infrastructure put in place for
ship to shore power. There should be a permanent cap on vehicle movement, a limit
on when their ships can enter, leave and stay in port. We beg that you limit ship
45 entry and berthing to weekdays between 6am and 10pm. Even people who live near
train lines do not have to suffer the train movements through the entire night. I have
to say that recent experience such as the ever-growing development Barangaroo do

not inspire confidence in the conduct of public-private harbour outcomes as part of any enforceable conditions of operation that the use of the multi-use facility a prohibition on expansion of the batching facility must be in place. In summary, please leave heavy industrial uses such as this batching facility in areas which are
5 designed for them, that is, in industrial precincts away from residential and harbourside recreational areas. Do not approve them here in an area that is primarily residential in character. Thank you.

10 MS TUOR: Thank you. Any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry. Gavin, sorry, I missed at the beginning. You're a resident at Pymont?

15 MR WALDIN: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Great.

MR WALDIN: Gibson Street at Balmain.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Great. Thank you very much. Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Gisela Spallek.

25 MS G. SPALLEK: Hello. Thanks for the introduction. I'm Gisela Spallek and thank you very much for the opportunity to address you panel this afternoon. I would acknowledge and pay my respect to the traditional owners of the land which I live and from which I am talking to you today, the Gomerigal people, who have been living around and Blackwattle Bay for tens of thousands of years. My husband and I are owners of an apartment on Jacksons Landing and we've been living here
30 since early 2021. While I as many other residents am very concerned about the impact the proposed Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant and Aggregate Handling Facility on the air and water pollution, noise level and visual impact will have, I would like to address you today primarily as a physician trained in ophthalmology.

35 As you know, in a concrete plant various materials are mixed to form concrete with include ingredients known to be detrimental to health such as fly ash, silica flume and flack. Fly ash, for instance, is obtained after combustion of coal and contains enhanced concentrations of trace elements, heavy metals present in coal such as arsenic, barium, cadmium, mercury and more, many of which have been proven to be
40 highly toxic to humans and other life. Silica fume or micro silica can irritate the eyes and it's proven that repeated exposure can cause eye damage. High exposure can cause flu-like illness with headache, fever, chills, aches, chest tightness and cough and repeated exposure can cause permanent lung damage. Flack is known to be able to cause skin irritation.

45 Exhaust and dust from the proposed plant will contain those elements which cumulatively lead to irritation of the skin and mucus membranes, especially of the

eyes and if inhaled the airways and lungs causing conditions from allergic dermatitis to debilitating lung disease. I'm not suggesting an unlikely scenario of thousands of residents developing silicosis or lung scenario but please keep in mind that the operating of the proposed Glebe Island concrete batching plant in such close
5 proximity to an established large residential area will have an affect by exposing its residents to hazardous elements emitted as invisible microscopic particles. For people suffering from pre-existing conditions such as asthma, symptoms will worsen when exposed to additional irritants and all this on top of the more easily measurable factors such as the increased noise level due to production and traffic 24/7 which by
10 themselves have been proven to have a negative impact on wellbeing and quality of life.

To summarise, there is a reason why workers in contact with the materials used at a concrete batching plant are required to wear protective equipment such as goggles,
15 glass respirators, disposable clothing. While I'm sure that Hanson will protect its own workforce and promised to follow regulation and protocol, it is inevitable that the operating of the proposed plant will expose the residents living around Glebe Island to known health hazards, not only 24/7 but also long-term. Thank you.

20 MS TUOR: Thank you very much. No questions. The next speaker is Yongxue Li.

MR Y. LI: Hello. Can you hear me, Commissioner?

MS TUOR: Yes, we can.
25

MR LI: Okay. So I am the owner of 12A Evolve and about 11 years ago I bought this apartment because I have a huge spacious roof terrace. I can overlook the two bridge: Harbour Bridge and the ANZAC Bridge. So this roof terrace impressed me a lot and make myself – I make a decision because of this to buy this apartment
30 within one week. I enjoy my life here for over 10 years, almost all seasons. I spend a lot of time on my roof terrace and but because of the new proposed concrete plant that will be built opposite to my apartment, my roof terrace I could not go out. I could not use my roof terrace almost every day and, you know, I think the things become so – so bad for me it will change my lifestyle. The reason I bought here –
35 because I stay in another apartment near – also in Jackson's Landing because I bought it and move here because of this building. My apartment is the nearest one to Glebe Island, to the seashore. That's the reason I bought it and I want to have my rest of my life here.

40 But, you know, when you have, you know, such kind of proposals like Hanson Concrete Plant and multipurpose utilisation facility to be built here, it give me a big, big shock because when I bought it I was told that it will be something like a high tech park that some global company like Google will move here and okay. That's fine. I think that will bring the prosperity for the economy, for the government and
45 no bad influence on our residential life and – but, you know, a lot of people talk about the dust, air – polluted air. Of course it will influence me heavily. I will have dust on my roof terrace. I could not go up. You know, it's a waste of my, you

know, property and ruin my lifestyle and I think if you look at the international cities, we have built up – we also developed from heavy industrial zone to such kind of a state – very advanced state but no one will change, you know, the industrial zone again back to heavy industry after, you know, 80 years, 70 years, you know.

5

You can look up international city and Sydney is top 3 in the world for the most suitable residential city in the world. I think as dependant planning department you deserve a close look at how other international city operate on such kind of a site, abandoned industrial zone site. How they would do it. How they would utilise such kind of a site. I think we can see most of the, you know, big city we utilise it as a cruise marina for international cruise or for yacht, it will bring a lot of, you know, beautiful for the residents, also for international tourist and I think in 10 years – I think 10 years Sydney will become and more popular in the whole world. Yes. And I think we will attract more international tourist for the city. So I don't think the department should sacrifice, you know, the long-term image of Sydney as a international harbour city and also it could not damage the people's health, you know, you know, like us.

You know, we have a lot of aged people in the building who live life in the past 20 10 years. You know, they move from the suburbs to here – yes – but not for polluted air, not for such dust. They want to live a healthy life. So whatever the government want to do – okay – we have to have – think of the people's health, the people's life. The purpose to develop the economy is for – to make people live more happily, more healthy, not make them suffer, you know. So that's what I'm want to talk and I think 25 I want to express my idea for these two years. I participate all such kind of occasions that – yes – officials comes, want to have a – they want to have some exchange of idea. I want to take this opportunity to express my idea. I strongly against, strongly object to this project and you can object too because if you live here, you have your husband or wife, you have your children, would you allow these things happen to 30 damage your family members? That's a question for all you, Commissioner. So I hope you can reject. Thank you so much for your concern. Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you. No questions.

35 MR LI: Yes. Bye. Okay.

MS TUOR: Our next speaker is [REDACTED] . [REDACTED] , can you hear us?

[REDACTED]: Hello. Thank you very much.

40

MS TUOR: Yes. We're ready for you to speak now.

[REDACTED]: Okay. Is that Ms Tuor?

45 MS TUOR: Yes, yes.

██████████: Okay. Thank you very much. Now, Commissioner Turo and Dr Peter Williams, thank you very much for hearing me. My name is ██████████ and I live in ██████████, Pyrmont. I'm directly impacted by the proposed development in Blackwattle and Rozelle Bays. My bedroom looks directly onto the berthing wharves and if the development goes ahead as planned, I will be severely and unconscionably impacted by noise nuisance generated by the 24 hour a day, seven days a week proposed operations. That for me is 365 sleepless nights every single year, every night a sleepless night as berthing and unloading of the ships goes ahead with the continuous bellowing thrum, thrum of ship engine noise while docked.

So today I'm talking to you specifically about noise nuisance and its serious impacts on human health including my own. This is not fanciful. The World Health Organisation in its 2018 report of a systemic study of all published scientific peer-reviewed research said the following about the damaging effects of environmental noise:

There is a higher incidence of cardiovascular disease, including high blood pressure, heart disease and stroke. Cognitive impairment can occur. Serious mental health effects such as anxiety and depression can occur and also adverse birth outcomes.

Importantly, the systemic reviews quantify and define the relationship between noise exposure and the risk of the adverse health outcomes. The WHO reports were published in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. The greatest offender in terms of source of noise nuisance from noise from transportation. A second eminent article was published in the Lancet Journal of Psychiatry in October 2017. It outlined how sleep disturbances are a contributory causal factor in the occurrence of mental health problems. I want to share something with you. Already on many occasions when massive container boat ships rather dock in the middle of the night I have found the only way to find relief from the noise is by throwing a mattress on my living room floor to see out the night there, fitfully emerging zombie-like late for work the next day that no amount of strong coffee can mediate the deleterious effects of. So the prospect of 20 hour a day port operations is terrifying for me.

I want to draw your attention to the fact that the New South Wales and the Federal Government already recognises the adverse impacts of noise on human health and does provide legal and regulatory frameworks to control those impacts. Some examples are the Commonwealth imposes air noise curfews from 11 pm to 6 pm under the Sydney Airport Curfew Act 1995 and Transport for New South Wales was the sponsor. It's now Road and Maritime in 1997 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act (Noise Control). The 2008 regulation outlines two key measures to eliminate noise on New South Wales waterways and working with the commercial vessels user group, specific undertakings were accepted by both parties: (1) no offensive noise will be emitted from any charter vessel at any time; (2) the

vessel will not anchor; and (3) will operate at a distance of at least 200 metres from any shore.

5 Also, there was a provision that for racing vessels that use engines a maximum noise level is enshrined at 95 decibels at 30 metres tested in accordance with Australian Standard 225419. So my question is if the New South Wales Government already knows what noise can do to human health, why would the New South Wales choose to ignore what it knows and fail to regulate commercial, industrial ship and shore noise while at the same time regulating party boats on the same body of water by imposing movement curfews and anchorage restrictions? I wanted to speak to you about the shibboleth that Sydney has always been a working port. This ignores complete the 60,000 year occupation of the waters where we sit right now by the Eora people of the Gadigal nation who enjoyed the waters for fishing, foraging and had quiet enjoyment thereof.

15 So to say that it's a working port as the manta to avoid the government's duty of protection to its citizens and its residents on the shoreline of quite enjoyment of their home and their hearth is very, very concerning. What does the second bell mean?

20 MS TUOR: The second bell means your time is up. So have you got much more to say or can you wind - - -

25 [REDACTED]: Well, I had one final comment and that was that actually the government had worked through the Commissioner of Sydney Planning Commission to sponsor and support and indeed encourage urban infill in – post-industrial urban infill in the very region I now live in. So it was a deliberate decision by government to have high density residential occupancy of this region known as a post-industrial region. Now the government is determining that it is not a post-industrial region. It's always been an industrial region. I've mentioned that that has not been the case for perhaps 60,000 years and it's only since the industrial revolution that – well, it was a revelation – industrial revolution that maritime industry came here. But my concluding comment is that COVID taught us one thing and that's that the Government of New South Wales has a duty of protection to its citizens and residents to provide a healthy environment and that includes protection from the adverse effects of 24 hour a day, seven day a week maritime operations, port operations as I've previously described and I thank you very much for your time, Commissioners.

40 MS TUOR: Thank you. All right. Thank you. The next speaker is Joy Tan.

MS J. TAN: Yes. Hi, can you hear me?

MS TUOR: Yes, we can.

45 MS TAN: Awesome. Hi. My name's Joy and thank you for listening. I – just like Nichole Harper, I used to live in Regatta Wharf. I'm actually speaking on behalf of my family, essentially, my husband and my child who's actually sitting next to me

who's home sick today because he actually does have quite a few lung issues and he does, you know, suffer a little bit from asthma. So my issue – I agree with pretty much what a lot of people have been saying already, especially what Nichole was saying in regards to the information that she researched and I'm glad that she did do
5 those research. But the thing is as a mum and as a human being just living literally across water the dust pollution from the concrete would be really bad and detrimental to everyone's health that lives around this area and considering that the fish markets is also opening very close by, it would be really bad for all that pollutant to be falling down while people are eating outside.

10 It will just be in the air. It's going to be constant and the noise as well is, as I say, very bad. At night-time I agree with Nichole. It is quite loud. It keeps everyone awake including my son sometimes. So – and he's in the room at the back but he can still hear it. So it is actually really loud. I don't know if you guys have actually
15 come to one of the – like one of the apartments to see how loud it actually is when the ships are in the port and my husband has called numerous times to let them know that it's really loud and he's actually even stood out – stood inside and recorded the noise decibel and it's – he says it's just not tolerable and I think he actually spoke earlier. His name is David Eyre. He was talking about this ship to shore solution
20 that some countries are doing at the moment to keep that noise down.

If – you know, this is something that has to happen you guys really need to put something in place so that the noise is kept to a minimal and so that we can actually enjoy our balcony because that was one of the reasons we moved to Pymont was to
25 actually sit on our balcony but with the noise pollution and the air pollution that's about to happen it's not going to be something that is going to be possible. We won't enjoy it. We can't have anyone come over. My mum who's also got very bad lungs won't be able to come over so we won't be able to, you know, have any entertainment on our balcony whatsoever. So I think it's a very serious issue and I
30 wanted to just bring that up to you guys as a mum and a family member in the community.

MS TUOR: All right. Thank you very much.

35 MS TAN: Okay. And that's my son there. He wanted to say hi but – yes.

MS TUOR: Hi. That's even better.

40 MS TAN: Yes. He's sick just – from school today but – yes – he wanted to agree and show his support with what we're saying. Yes. Because it is not – it's not good. It's not good for any of us. Okay.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much.

45 DR WILLIAMS: Thanks very much.

MS TAN: Thanks so much. Bye bye.

DR WILLIAMS: Bye bye.

MS TUOR: Our next speaker is Anthony Greene.

5 MR A. GREENE: Thank you. And thank you again for the opportunity to submit a
case, obviously, against the proposal and let me go into the rationale behind that.
I'm an owner resident living in the area for 16 years with my wife and we've seen a
complete transformation in that part of the harbour in that time from the early days of
10 the car carriers coming through to what is now a hub for a lot of people in respect to
the parkland that's been built overlooking Glebe Island. So we're now in a position
that we're saying that we're going to change that landscape completely by virtue of
this proposal. So it's almost inconceivable that we've created this utopian
environment and we're now looking to impose an industrial complex with rather
15 large stacks on the skyline as well and I just wanted to go into some of the specifics
around why it is that these concerns that we have are valid.

The matter of noise pollution's been raised already many times today but it's not a
well-known fact that the most prevalent form of pollution across the globe is noise
20 pollution and what we're talking about with this proposal is regardless of what
decibels recorded there's going to be noise and the other factor that hasn't been
mentioned enough today is the noise travelling across water is significantly greater
and, of course, there's a stretch of water between that island and Balmain and the
Pymont Peninsula. So we're also talking about a significant amount of disturbance
24 hours a day that's going to affect residents on both sides. In terms of the
25 specifics, there's a couple of things that cause concern from the Todoroski air quality
report dated the 18th of December in respect to this question of building ventilation.

The reports states categorically that there's a contradictory commitment in the EIS
around filters. So I think it's important for the Commission to realise that whatever
30 is proposed has to be enshrined in whatever the agreements are that are agreed
between the parties. So we're already talking about a contradiction between what's
been proposed in respect to the filters and, in fact, what's in the reports. The other
concerns we have are around traffic. We're talking about thousands of truck
movements daily. We're talking about the noise that's associated with that. We're
35 talking about an inconsistency with the air quality impact assessment and the traffic
impact and there was a note somewhere in the correspondence relating to the noise
already emitting from ANZAC Bridge. That changes dramatically during the course
of a 24 hour cycle. That noise is not constant. The noise from this proposed
industrial complex is constant. So it's not correct to say that the ANZAC Bridge
40 noise is in any way related to the circumstances surrounding this proposal.

Some of the other concerns are around diesel and the fumes. We've also seen the
proposal quote the use of low sulphur fuel but there's no evidence of compliance
enforcement at White Bay in respect to that use. Something else that's concerning.
45 There's the 24/7 operation as I've said and also the question of alternatives. What
alternatives have been considered when you recognise that Botany Bay has been set
aside for so much of this industrial supply, if you like, of infrastructure requirements

around the State Government and their initiatives and, look, in summarising, the concerns that we have as a community and there's a lot of us that are expressing concerns, not just those that have chosen to voice their concerns today, is that there hasn't been a complete transparency associated with it.

5

Yes, we have the opportunity now but it has come as a bit of a surprise for a lot of us that we're now faced with this predicament. So I'd like to just finish by again thanking you for the opportunity. But the concerns that we have are valid. They are health concerns and they go to the pollutants that are going to derive from this proposal. Thank you.

10

MS TUOR: Thank you. Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

15

MS TUOR: The next speaker is David Wilkins. You're on mute. I can't hear you.

MR D. WILKINS: How's that? Can you hear me?

20

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes, I can hear you now.

MR WILKINS: Okay. Good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you for inviting me this afternoon. I could speak on any number of concerns but – that have been already covered so I won't go back over those. So I'll limit my talk just to one issue. I consider it totally unacceptable for the New South Wales DPI and E to state and I'll quote what they state in their report:

25

30

While the proposal would result in some exceedances of the relevant noise criteria at the nearest residence in Pyrmont, these residences were constructed with in-built noise attenuation in recognition of their proximity to the working harbour.

That statement is an absolutely disgrace. Not only is it cynical, but disingenuous but also it ignores that on hot summer nights when all windows are open for cool, fresh air the noise would be oppressive. It also overlooks the fact raised by Joy, two speakers before, that hundreds of nearby apartments have open balconies and they would become unusable. Requiring a large population to close their windows and not use their open balconies 24 hours a day, seven days a week permanently so as to avoid pollution particles and noise is evidence, in my opinion, of a legally enforceable action against a public nuisance for which Hanson, the New South Wales Government and the Ports Authority would become defendants. Please, do not permit this development to be approved or to continue. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

35

40

45

MS TUOR: Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, David. Just to – you're resident in the Evolve?

MR WILKINS: Sorry. Yes. I'm in Watercrest which is 38 Refinery Drive, Pymont and I'm a resident here for seven and a half years.

DR WILLIAMS: Great. Good. Thank you.

5

MR WILKINS: Like the others, I've heard the noises of the ships that have come in. A number of times I have complained about the noise when I've been woken at various hours including at 3 am and 4.30 am but I won't go back over those. You've had those covered already by many people.

10

DR WILLIAMS: Great. Thank you very much, David.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much.

15

MR WILKINS: Okay.

MS TUOR: Jennifer Poon is the next speaker.

MS J. POON: Hi can you hear me?

20

MS TUOR: Yes, we can.

25

MS POON: Hi. Thanks. So first of all good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you for the time and the opportunity to speak today. I'm here to discuss and voice my strong objection against the development of the Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant. As a new owner and resident not only to Pymont but to Australia I have come to this neighbourhood as a new place to call home and before I actually deeply considered where to move my partner and I were looking very much into what the future of this neighbourhood would be and that also included researching the area proposals and so the first point I have to make is that the concrete works are not in alignment with the Pymont Peninsula strategy as is laid out by the New South Wales Government as a supposed place for families and local residents to thrive.

30

35

You know, I'm thinking about starting a family soon and for all of the reasons that the previous residents and concerned citizens have spoken about on, you know today I am concerned about the ability for Pymont to deliver this – you know, the value of delivering a place that people are proud to call home and to thrive outdoors and actually be able to live their lives in their apartments and homes. So as a local resident this plant will be detrimental to my everyday routine both from a, you know, physical health air and sound pollution but also from a mental wellbeing aspect. You know, I came to this country right before COVID started and mental safety and wellbeing are on the top of my list when it comes to where I want to live and the considerations that I take into – to actually move into Pymont.

40

45

So, you know, I would say that one of my favourite things to do every day is actually to walk by the water and look at the view and enjoy that in the comfort of a sound – a relatively sound free environment and as David had just mentioned prior, it's very,

very clear to hear when you open your window in a hot summer night you can hear the chatter of even the boats passing by and I doubt that a 24/7 concrete batching plant would be less oppressive than that somehow. So the other main point I wanted to say is, of course, as we know in a COVID world I know from corporate environment I now work from home three or more days a week. I think we all know that that's not going to change for many, many people in Pymont any time soon. There's an industrial plant across the water and, again, as David had mentioned, noise travels more strongly across the water.

10 You know, being able to work efficiently in that kind of environment is just, I don't think, possible and I believe it is unconscionable for – to actually to accept this development. It's one that I feel is regard and without consideration of the thousands of man hours that have into cohesive and I think well thought out government planning and it's one that treads on the ability for locals and for people at Pymont to live comfortably and safely and without pollution in Pymont. Thank you for your time and I'm happy to take any questions.

MS TUOR: Thank you. No questions so - - -

20 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS TUOR: - - - thank you very much. And the final speaker for the day is Andrew Sunol.

25 MR A. SUNOL: Hi, Commissioner, and everyone attending the public meeting and thanks for your time today. I've had a chance to listen to a couple of the other speakers before me so I'll make this relatively quick but I just wanted to echo my strong objection to the Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant being built for a couple of reasons and the majority again have been repeated before me. The first one is, obviously, the environmental impact of pollution primarily with air, water, sound pollution and the impact on the surrounding residential buildings. So there seems to be a clear lack of engineering advice and studies that have been put forward by the concrete plant owners in relation to the impact on surrounding residential neighbourhoods particularly in relation to sound travelling – as we've heard, sound travelling across water.

The residents can already hear the party boats speaking, people on the street likely coming – likely walking around late at night from the casino or wherever and the sound really bounces between the buildings and creates an echo effect that the residents can hear and I think the works that occur at a concrete batching plant such as proposed that you really need to be clear on the impact to residents, many of whom – as Jennifer said, many of whom are working in the area – working from home in the area due to COVID and changing – the evolving way we work from our homes. So for me that's really the number 1 concern and this sort of flows into my second concern about the mental health impact on residents and my concern around the mental health impact is a lot of residents of Pymont use the parks and opens spaces and the walking areas that the New South Wales Government itself was sort

of recently promoting, the ability to walk from The Rocks through to Pymont is something that the New South Wales Government was really pushing as a great achievement and to arguably ruin the ambience of the Pymont section of that walk, particularly as we – as the government starts to look at, you know, transferring the
5 Glebe Island Bridge to continue the walkway through to Balmain, really, will have an impact on residents who go down to the waterfront and look at the ANZAC Bridge at the end of the – in the morning as a way to begin their day or end their day or at any point in between.

10 Having noise pollution in there will significantly impact, I think, the residents of Pymont's mental health and that's something I think should be taken – like, pursued pretty seriously in today's day and age, particularly coming out of a COVID – coming out of the COVID sort of pandemic and sort of point which I'll conclude on is the proposed Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant just seems to be against so
15 many of the New South Wales Government's other initiatives to really bring Pymont into the forefront of the – as a global sort of suburb of Sydney and really open Pymont up to both residents, tourists, business, all of these important stakeholders and having this concrete batching plant there really just does not seem like a good use of taxpayers' money given the significant investment going into the
20 Pymont Metro, the Pymont Place Strategy, as I said, like, continuing the walkway up over the Glebe Island Bridge connecting Pymont to Balmain and Glebe and these other areas.

It really seems to diminish the value of the taxpayers' dollars for all of these other
25 investments and, in particular, I'd really like to see a feasibility study done of alternative locations because it hasn't really been put to me as to why it needs to – why this sort of needs to happen on the Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant and whether there are any alternative locations that can supply concrete to the Greater Sydney area. Thank you. Yes. Any questions from the commissioner?

30 MS TUOR: Thank you very much. Yes. No questions. Thank you.

MR SUNOL: Thank you.

35 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

MS TUOR: That brings us to the end of the public meeting for the proposed Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant and Aggregate Handling Facility SSD 8544. Thank you to everyone who has participated in this important process. Dr Peter Williams
40 and I have appreciated your input. Just a reminder that if you still wish to make a submission simply click on the have your say portal of our website or send a submission to us via email or post. The deadline for written comments is 5 pm next Monday the 24th of May 2021. In the interests of openness and transparency we'll be making a full transcript of this public meeting available on our website in the next
45 few days. At the time of determination the Commission will publish its statements of reasons for decision which will outline how the panel has taken into account the

community's views as part of its decision making process. Finally, thank you for your participation again in our public meeting today. Good afternoon.

5 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[3.20 pm]