

Glebe Island Silos Throughput Capacity Increase (DA-188611) - Submissions

Submission Type	Suburb	Position	Submission	Political Donations
Personal	Glebe Point	Support	A facility of this type is clearly needed and its impacts have been well-considered and are largely at the margin, given the existing throughput capacity is not without impact.	No
Personal	Glebe	Object	Unacceptable noise and traffic effects will be caused by the proposed throughput capacity increase at the Glebe Island Silos for holding and distributing cementitious material from 500,000 tonnes per annum to 1,200,000 tpa. Noise from transferring material from the increased number of ships to the silos will be marginally increased, especially at night, according to the Noise Impact Assessment. However the impact is almost certainly understated because it assumes that the increased noise will be mitigated by installation of new equipment and observance of the recommended maintenance and operational mitigatory measures. This pious hope is unlikely to be realised in practice. As the Assessment recognises and is demonstrated in Figures 6.1 and 6.2, this noise will mostly be experienced in the proximal areas of Balmain but extending also to the apartments at Jacksons Landing. However, traffic noise will be experienced much more widely in Rozelle, Pyrmont and Glebe. The Noise Impact Assessment provides a cursory examination of that effect and neglects the cumulative effect which has become increasingly noticeable in those suburbs. Noise from the Anzac Bridge, especially at night and from 4 am has significantly increased in recent years and become a major source of disturbance to residents of those suburbs. That noise is very likely to further increase when the Westconnex interchange is in operation and again when the northern beaches link has been completed. The cumulative effect on the quality of life and especially sleep in those suburbs will be unacceptable. The Traffic Impact Assessment similarly understates the impact of this proposal, especially because its assessment is based on old data from 2018 and 2019 and ignores the traffic increase that will result from Westconnex. The Anzac Bridge, The Crescent, Victoria Road and the City West Link are very congested at present particularly in peak hours and when disruption occurs to Sydney roads and/or public transport. Those arteries are at a tipping point and cannot sustain further traffic increases. While Victoria Road and the City West Link may loose some traffic pressure following the opening of Westconnex, the Anzac Bridge will carry much more traffic and The Crescent is likely to become a more significant distributor from the interchange as well as a route for 'rat running'. In addition to the congestion this will cause, and noise discussed above, these roads are already in very poor condition and will not support further increases. Again, this is a question of cumulative impact. In view of the above, the proposed throughput capacity increase at Glebe Island Silos is undesirable and the application should be rejected.	No
Personal	Glebe	Support	I think it's a great location for industrial activity to be increased, considering so much industrial space is being lost elsewhere in Sydney. The loss of the cement facility to the new Fish Market development in Glebe, being a case in point.	No
Personal	Pyrmont	Object	In respect to the proposed application it is not sustainable that an increase from 500,000 tonnes to 1,200,000 tonnes will not cause significantly more noise, dust and traffic issues in the Balmain and Pyrmont areas. I note the current application is only related to the existing Silos and Berth 8 in Glebe Island. What assurances can be built into the application approval to ensure that in future the proposed new Batching Plant at Glebe Point Island and Multi Function Shed and the adjacent Berth on the Pyrmont side of Glebe Island do not get taken over and used to facilitate the additional 700,000 tonnes of cement delivery and/or processing ? It would not surprise if this application is approved that we then have a variation to the existing Batching Plant approval and/or Multi Function shed and wharf - to somehow have it included as a receival depot for the adjacent Silos increased capacity?. Alternatively the Batching Plant might then claim it needs to increase "its" capacity because the existing silos now have an additional 700,000 tonnes of cement to process. In summary primary concern is - if this application is approved in its current form - the approval might allow in the future for the owners/operators of the new Batching Plant and Multi Function shed and wharves/berths on the Pyrmont side of Glebe Island to vary their operating hours and/or ship throughput - resulting in a very detrimental flow on of noise, dust and traffic to the large residential population living just across the water in Jacksons Landing Pyrmont.	No
Personal	Rozelle	Object	The foreshore surrounding the Glebe Island Silos is being returned to the public, including the White Bay Area and the new Fishmarkets. It makes absolutely no sense to even have a cement silos facility right in the middle of this development, let alone increasing its throughput. The reverse should occur, it should be bought and decommissioned to include in the refurbishment of the foreshore. Its presence now compromises the integrity of the harbour foreshore.	No
Personal	Pyrmont	Object	I object because of: Significant increase in shipping movements which will result in more noise, light and air pollution. Major increase in traffic throughput despite of the fact that this capacity increase is to support non-central Sydney needs. The approval must have the following conditions:- Vessel movement curfew between 10:00pm and 6am No crane and bucket loading Limit the approval period to a maximum of 12 years Require ship to shore power within 5-7 years	No

Personal	Rozelle	Object	Air Quality Assessment is unsatisfactory, there will be a significant increase in NOx & SO2 emissions due to the doubling of the time at berth without shore power infrastructure. No measurement of the actual impact of high sulphur burning ships at berth was taken, and the chosen representative station at Rozelle is in the middle of parkland on the other side of a hill. The berth time from cruise ships at Berths 4 & 5, led to detectable air quality problems, noise issues and property staining from airborne particles. Public demand led to the installation of the air quality monitoring station at WBCT. The values measured there are already of public concern and should not be used as a baseline as acceptable to the local community. Similar effects will be noticeable along the Batty St as we are directly opposite Berth 8, as well as the rest of the shoreline area. The submission does not seem to cover the impacts at the batching plant, there were little details to the impact of doubling its throughput outside of truck movements and material transfer? Proposal does not seem to align with White Bay Precincts renewal, acknowledging the desire to work with existing port users, this proposal looks to prioritise a commercial venture with no benefit to the local community. In all likelihood it will be to the detriment of the local community from environmental and traffic impact.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	The application goes against the initial details of what was proposed a throughput of 500,000 tpa. The application now looks to increase that capacity by some 240%. This is totally unacceptable. The increase in capacity brings with it an increase in traffic that would result from this. So increased congestion in and around the site as well as increase in the amount of noise pollution and wear and tear on surrounding roads. Who is going to pay for the upkeep of the local roads in this even? The plant should be restricted to it's current proposed level of 500,000 TPA.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	Glebe Island Silos is surrounded by the residential buildings & parks, which is a pleasant & relaxing living area, especially for kids and senior people. Many people do their daily exercise around that area. The current traffic situation has already been busy especially during the peak hours. Increasing the annual throughput capacity of cementitious material from 500,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 1,200,000 tps obviously will greatly cause more severe issues to local area, including air and road pollution, noise, traffic jam, road damage, big truck threaten both for cars on road and pedestrians (Especially for kids and senior people). Overall, I object to this development application.	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	I live in an apartment complex facing White Bay which is already subject to noise from activity in the bay and Glebe Island. We have been advised of the proposed 24hour 7day operation of the "multifunction facility" on Glebe Island but we were not advised at the time of a projected increase in throughput of this magnitude-700,000 tonnes p.a. This is an overreach and should not, surely cannot, be approved. Also how can it be compatible with the Government's much touted plans for the revitalisation of White Bay especially if more housing is envisaged?	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	I object to the further expansion of shipping and bulk materials handling at Glebe Island. There's already too much noise and air pollution. It's 2022 - long past time to move this sort of polluting activity out of the center of Sydney. Bays West should be developed with more residential and office precincts, more public amenities, the continuation of the wonderful Sydney foreshore walk etc. Whatever happened to the Bays West Transformation Plan? This state government seems to have no interest in making Sydney a beautiful global city. If Cement Australia is allowed to increase its throughput, it should at least be subject to a curfew on ships coming and going and unloading and it should have to do something to reduce its current noise levels.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	Over the last fifteen years thousands of apartments have been built around Glebe Island (approved by the state government). Accordingly, the port activity should be declining not increasing. And there should be more restrictions on what is already there to reduce air and noise pollution. The state government should be protecting the health of local communities.	No
Personal	Rozelle	Object	As a resident of Rozelle I have been heavily impacted by the recent Rozelle Interchange Project, as has the wider community in the area. The looming completion of the Rozelle Interchange project was meant to provide relief from the construction and associated traffic in the area. Many residents including myself are experiencing construction fatigue and are expecting significant relief in the near future. To propose to follow on from the Rozelle Interchange project with further increases in cement truck movements from James Craig Rd into City West Link does not sit well. Any increase in traffic movements will have a detrimental effect on local traffic for cyclists and other road users alike. Like many other locals, I cycle to work using the City West Link and the Crescent shared cycle paths and the now myriad of pedestrian crossings required to traverse them. I also drive a car in the area on occasions. Traffic around the James Craig Rd/City West Link intersection is appalling at present and it can take a long time on a bicycle to cross the 6 crossings to enable travel from Victoria Rd to James Craig Rd, a distance of about 200m. It's often worse in a car. With every increase in truck movements from the Silos plant there will clearly be associated increases in traffic light rotations at James Craig Rd and City West Link. Residents and local road users, cyclists and pedestrians will again be delayed further, not to mention deafened by trucks, or put at high risk by close proximity to heavy vehicles at road crossings and on cycleways.	No

Personal	Pymont	Object	Our strong objections to any increase of throughput in the Cement plant on Glebe Island. Dear Minister, We are residents at 24 Refinery Drive Pymont and look across the water to the Cement Australia plant on Glebe Island. We are also affected greatly by the existing traffic on Anzac Bridge, as we regularly use that bridge to do our shopping and visit friends. There are a number of reasons why we object strongly to any increase in throughput at the existing cement plant. 1. Increasing from the current 500,000 tonnes p.a. to 1,200,000 tonnes p.a, is an increase of 240%, more than twice the current volume. There will of course be a commensurate increase in heavy truck movements, noise, and dust. 2. Traffic is already at crawling pace for two to three hours inbound every morning and outbound every evening at peak hours on Anzac bridge. Increasing heavy truck movements associated with the cement plant across and near the bridge will make the traffic far worse. Those huge cement trucks each take up the space of about 5 private cars, so the effect on traffic will be disastrous. 3. There will also be an increase in ship movements in and out, with a commensurate increase in noise, and air pollution and those ships runs their engines all night whilst they are docked at the port. Unloading cement causes airborne dust. On sunny days when ships are unloading we can see the dust blowing around the dock and harbour areas. Increasing that will have a very bad effect on the health of all residents, especially on small children. 4. This is a very high-density residential area. The Balmain peninsular on the Northern side and the Pymont area on the Southern side are among the highest density residential areas in Sydney. The increased noise, dust and traffic will be damaging to the physical and mental health of local residents living both North and South of the cement plant. 5. There are already sufficient cement plants in and around Sydney, and they are obviously filling whatever requirements are being made by the construction industry. Cement Australia does not need to increase its throughput on Glebe Island as the increased volume can be handled by existing plants.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	To whom it may concern, This is a crazy increase, more than double the original proposal. Why have the company done this? To get the initially approval through on lower numbers, and then more than double it later? What do you think? Why wasn't the original application made with these numbers? I would be interested in your thoughts. Naturally this will more than double the noise, light and air pollution. These are probably irrelevant to the company, but is very important to the people living around Pymont and Glebe, who have made it their homes. Already traffic is terrible, is there a plan for this? Please consider our homes and our future. I object, and I implore you to consider our situation. Yours sincerely, Andrew Howard	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	Cement Silos We are residents of Pymont located at Jackson's Landing. We have listened and watched the proposed development of Glebe Island with interest and now dismay! Pymont profile has changed dramatically in the last 15 years it is now a residential community. As residents of a we believe little meaningful consideration has been given as to how the proposed increased industrial development will impact on our daily lives. As residents our community will experience the full impact of returning GLEBE ISLAND to an industrial harbour. Our concerns about other development has largely fell on deaf ears and we are concerned that the proposed increased capacity of the Cement Plant will be simply approved and rubber-stamped as its intrinsic value and purpose is to support the Port Authority other projects. Increased capacity at the Cement Plant will have a significant cumulative impact on our community; noise, pollution, large-scale trucks. The site is not suitable for such increased capacity indeed given its proximity to the suburbs of East Balmain and Pymont it begs the question is this area suitable at all for such industrial development? At minimum I ask that you: Limit the number of vessels and impose a curfew between 10:00pm and 6am Do not allow for any crane and bucket loading as the noise impact locally will be disruptive for residents Limit the approval period to a maximum of 5 years Require the operators to put in place ship to shore power so as to avoid the vessels running engines all night to power off loading and support vessels.	No

Personal	Pymont	Object	This application represents a significant increase in shipping with the obvious resulting increase in noise, light and air pollution. in the surrounding area, despite the fact that this increase is to support non-central Sydney needs. The very nearby residential area is already objecting to the prospect of such pollution from the proposed Hansons' Concrete Batching Plant and the proposed Multi User Facility and the return of the Cruise boats. I can assure you that no further increase in any industrial activities is welcome. Glebe Island may still be recognised as a working harbour- however residents who bought in the area during its gentrification, ---did not envisage that after years of time and extraordinary expense to clear the area of industrial pollution the island would once again be ear-marked for heavy industry. It was industrialisation with high levels of pollution in all forms which led to the decay of the area and a dramatic decrease in population by the mid-eighties. Have you learnt nothing from the history of the area???	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	I object to the proposal and identify the following issues: - The proposal to more than double the current throughput will cause a significant increase in shipping movements, which will result in more noise, light and air pollution to the surrounding residents. - There will be a major increase in traffic throughput, most of which will be supporting non central Sydney needs. - The Air Quality Report should not discount readings of 2019 simply because of the bushfires. Cement Australia had an increased throughput of 600,000 tpa that year. An increase of throughput by double (to 1,200,000 tpa) would cause a significant increase of impact to air, light and noise pollution. I request that any approval applies the following four conditions: - Vessel movement curfew between 10.00pm and 6.00am - No crane and bucket loading - Limit the approval period to a maximum of 10 years - Require ship to shore power within 2 years	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	My concern is that you are turning a beautiful residential and tourist hub into an industrial site with no concern for those living nearby. Allowing pollution, light, noise into the comfort of peoples homes. Unfortunately you are dealing with humans and not machinery and objects. Please consider this in all your actions	No
Personal	Erskineville	Object	This is a bad location to be increasing the throughput of cement as this is a residential area. Also cement production creates large quantities of greenhouse gases which must be reduced under the current climate emergency. Also the entire NSW planning process is just a facade. Submissions opposed to a development may have completely watertight and rock solid argument and the response to such submissions may totally fail elementary principles of logic or evidence but the project may proceed nevertheless. Any number of previous DA exhibitions demonstrate this to be the case. I have no doubt that this submission along with many others will be tossed aside.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	As a long term resident of Pymont, having the cement silos located so close to residential area is already a big issue from a health and environmental perspective. The current capacity is already too high and yet this submission to more than double the silo capacity is ridiculous. I strongly object on the following grounds: 1. The increased shipping movements along the waterways in Pymont will increase pollution in all respects : noise/light/air. This will prove devastating toe health of residents and people in the area. In addition, the safety of leisure/pleasure small crafts that enhance the lifestyle of residents and visitors will be severely affected. 2. The increase in road traffic due to the vehicles will not increase pollution of all sorts but the roads and capacities will be severely affected. This in turn will affect the overall safety of the roads in the area. Pymont has long been a coveted place to live, work and play. This submission to significantly increase silo capacities is not reasonable and will greatly adversely affect the lifestyle of residents and their health. I hope the proper authorities will consider the following : 1. There should be curfews implemented on movements of any vehicles; particularly after office hours when people return to their homes and need their rest. 2. There should be no crane or bucket loading - due to the noise and air pollution created not to mention the safety aspects of this practice. 3. There should be a time limit (reasonable fixed number of years maximised to 5 years) implemented when these silos will be in operation. 4. There should be ship to shore power implemented as soon as possible. I appeal to the authorities to carefully consider the long term impact of such hazardous activities operating within such close proximity to residential areas. Thank you	No

Personal	Pymont	Comment	My concerns are about noise pollution-air quality-traffic congestion:- Any increase created by establishing the concrete plant above what currently exists adds to the environmental impact of the working harbour & directly affects the people who have to co-exist in the immediate environs. The plant would contribute to poor health outcomes for residents and would set a precedent for further major works.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	I am making this submission on the behalf and my wife and myself as residents of Pymont for 22 years. Many changes have occurred over this time in the Pymont and surrounds, most have been positive. However the approved changes/plans for Glebe Island are a disgrace and has created pollution in all forms. Noise, dust and visual pollution are all evident in the plans which will degrade the area, not to mention the already overloaded road network. The application to increase the capacity of the cement throughput 3 fold will, if approved, will serve only to increase all the foreseeable problems many times over. Increases in shipping, traffic and handling will only downgrade tis beautiful residential even further. Consideration must be given to the following should this application be approved: *Vessel movement curfew between 10:00pm and 6am *No crane and bucket loading *Limit the approval period to a maximum of 12 years *Require ship to shore power within 5-7 years Overall consideration must be given to those residents that call Pymont home. tion the potential traffic issues in an already Respectively, Geoff and colleen Moule	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	The entire project is invasive to the surrounding communities and in Jackson's Landing we are literally a short few metres across from this facility. The noise and dust is already a concern that will be a daily factor for us. To suggest upping the production by so much is just unacceptable when you are in the midst of the thousands of residents in a concentrated area nearby.	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	I object to this proposal due to the increased noise and air pollution which will result on more than doubling the throughput of glebe island silos. The local area is already impacted negatively by noise and fumes from this facility. When a ship is unloading, vessel generators are running 24 hours per day and vessels can be berthed for a number of days at a time. The noise report states that this facility has previously exceeded permissible noise levels during nighttime hours, additional vessel traffic will only increase the probability of this occurring more frequently. Despite being within acceptable levels, current vessel noise is amplified during the night and disrupts sleep. Increasing the throughput would increase the number of ships docking, making the aforementioned issues permanent, 7 days per week. I also have concerns around pollution and the detrimental impact on air quality from the presence of additional vessels with generators and the fumes they emit.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	This proposal is to increase the use of this property from an annual throughput capacity of cementitious material from 500,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 1,200,000 tpa. That is a 140% increase. Whilst there will be no construction works it inevitably means a very substantial increase in transport movements, both in and out of the facility. Consent was granted on 23 July 2021 for the nearby Hansen site permitting the construction of a batching plant with a capacity of 1,000,000 tpa. The capacity of the original site is not apparent from the planning application, or the associated correspondence. However, it appears to have been smaller than that of Cement Australia's existing site. This suggests a massive increase in both truck movements, as well as shipping, in the White Bay area. It appears that these two developments are being viewed separately. Given that they are in close proximity to a large residential population the impact of the two in terms of noise, light and environmental pollution will be significant. (In addition, it is proposed to develop Blackwattle Bay so that there are an additional 5,600 jobs, 2,800 residents and 1,550 dwellings). I note the various reports accompanying the current proposal, but none look at this as a whole. The result is a flawed process. I understand the short-term demand for increased cement, which is one of the products contributing most to climate change. However, the very substantial intensification of the use of the site is unacceptable. It produces very little additional direct employment and will simply gift a considerable financial gain to Cement Australia without any of the environmental and social liabilities. It is for all of the above reasons that I object to this proposal.	No

Personal	Pymont	Object	I am strongly against this proposal. The increase in capacity is massive, around 140%. The result will a be huge increase in truck movements making traffic congestion in Balmain and Pymont and on the ANZAC bridge far worse than it already is. The area has become one of the most highly populated parts of Sydney, with thousands of apartments being approved. Many thousands of people now live in close proximity to the silos and Glebe Island. There has been massive urban renewal approved throughout the area over the last twenty or so years, with more to follow at the old fish markets site. It is completely inappropriate to condone a plan to suddenly commence what amounts to reindustrialisation of the suburbs. There will also be considerable increases of all forms pollution including noise, particulate/air and light.These effects on traffic and pollution levels will add to the huge increase in traffic congestion and serious pollution levels that will be caused by the proposed Multi-User Facility and Cement Batching Plant on Glebe Island. The result will be to make living in and experiencing quite enjoyment of our home impossible. It will almost certainly cause serious issues regarding our physical and mental health. We ask that the proposed development is not approved.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	The proposed increase in throughput will drastically increase noise, air, and water pollution, as well as ship traffic. Given the plant's proposed additional output is intended for non-central Sydney, it should not be approved - the applicant should increase output in a more suitable location. If the proposal goes ahead over community objections, there must be strong rules in place to provide the community with peace and quiet - a vessel movement curfew between 10pm and 8am, and a ban on bucket and crane loading. Requiring ship-to-shore power from the commencement of additional output, to limit ship noise, would also be reasonable. Please also put a time limit on any approval - 5 years seems reasonable.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	Significant increase in shipping movements is indicated which will result in more truck movements, more noise, more light and more air pollution at a time when government should be moving to reduce carbon emissions. The surrounding area is also likely to be opened to future development eg current fish market site, which will only extend the reach of the adverse impacts of the development. Concurrent with not increasing ship movements there should be a curfew on vessel movement between 10:00pm and 6am and a prohibition on crane and bucket loading. The fact that there will be no ship to shore power from the commencement of operation is outrageous, particularly in light of the egregious decision to omit ship to shore power from the White Bay Passenger Terminal when it was built. Do approval authorities learn nothing from past errors? The absence of onshore power in new port developments would not be permitted in most major ports around the world. Do do so in this case is third rate when we should be making every endeavour to reduce carbon emissions. If the cost to the project is economically prohibitive, then the project is not viable in 2022. Noting that this complaint has consistently fallen on deaf ears with planning authorities, the very least that should be done is to make it mandatory to instal it within a fixed time frame, say three years. Any approval given should be limited to a maximum of 12 years. We have all seen the many development proposals put up for the Bays Precinct. Its long term future does not lie with concrete. Times change rapidly and the planning options for the precinct need to be kept as open as possible.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	I live directly opposite Glebe Island. This increase in throughput will affect my ability to live my previous life. There will be less sleep due to the increase in noise. It will necessitate keeping our doors and windows closed more often to avoid the increase in dust which is already significant. Our apartments have been planned with large balconies in order to live an indoor / outdoor life and I believe that on top of the projects already approved (Hanson Concrete Plant , Port Authority MUF, shipping associated with same, West Harbour tunnel & Westconnex) we will end up locked inside. Things that will alter our ability to live in the area; Dust, air pollution Light spill Noise Traffic increase Vessel engine noise and pollution The current tonnage of 500,000 has not been too intrusive but a 3 fold increase is definitely going to cause problems. How does this development fit with the governments objective to build family units in the surrounding area? The documentation in support of this project are reshapes of Hanson Cement and are not independent nor do they take in the total developments proposed for Glebe Island.	No

Personal	Pymont	Object	My objections relate to the increase in an already enormous throughput capacity, 500,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 1,200,000 tpa. Pymont is one of the most densely populated suburbs in NSW with demographics including small children and the elderly. The amount of noise, pollution and other environmental and personal health issues appears to be growing exponentially with little or no attempt at consideration of those who live or work close to Glebe Island. As a result of being a community mostly of high or medium rise developments the apartments all have balconies which are used on a regular basis due to size and weather making the extra space extremely relevant. This Development Application (DA-188611) is in addition to that granted for the Hansen batching plant which is in close proximity and appears to allow for considerably increased capacity (1,000,000 tpa) significantly more than in prior years. Both of these projects suggest, and indeed already involve increased noise, movement of vehicles and pollution but the numbers quoted will make this up to 150% worse for both the current residents and those envisaged in relation to the over-urbanisation of Black Wattle Bay. The Anzac Bridge will be dwarfed by high rise and concrete making facilities and residents dealing with the effects of noise, pollution and stress levels associated with moving around the area. Ships arriving and leaving at any time but particularly during times most people are asleep, are incredibly disruptive and, day or night, invariably pour obnoxious materials in a grey plume from their funnels. They often need to turn around on approach to Glebe Island which adds considerably to the noise, power required and associated pollution. All of this happens already with 25 or more ships per annum but to double that number together with the noise, pollution and vehicle movements of trucks etc is untenable. Where is the ship to shore power seen elsewhere in the world's ports? Arrival, departure and unloading involve unbearable amounts of repetitive noise. What are the curfew times? How long is the approval period and is there a 5 or 10 year limit? Any consideration has to include an Environmental impact study on behalf the residents and workers affected by this unbelievably high increase with the intention perhaps of making an inner city suburb back into the commercial hub it was before someone saw fit to build considerable residential blocks and turn it into the once quiet, pleasant and relatively pollution free area to the west of the Harbour Bridge. My objection is not to progress and need, but to walking all over the current and future communities who call the area in close proximity to Glebe Island "home". It seems to be the area of Glebe Island, once envisaged by the State Government for its views of Sydney Harbour and Bridge, appears to be being taken over by stealth.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	I strongly object to this proposal. The proposed development would dramatically increase the handling and processing of bulk materials on Glebe Island and the level of water and road traffic in the surrounding area. It is self-evident that this explosion of activity would have significant detrimental consequences for the environment in terms of air and noise pollution and traffic congestion. Increased industrial activity on Glebe Island, with all the associated congestion and air and noise pollution, will seriously negate the attractiveness of the area as a destination, thereby undermining the commercial viability of the metro station and other improvements.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	My submission is in relation to the noise and and most importantly the pollution that will emanate from the ships that berth and unload at the wharves. Any increase in noise above what currently occurs would be unacceptable. Despite what the noise assessment states we have to keep our windows closed at night when ships are being unloaded. The noise level is clearly audible and will disturb sleep at any increased level. Secondly, diesel pollution coming from the ships must increase with the increased activity. The State government has already agreed to install ship to shore power for White Bay terminal precisely for the danger in regard to air pollution. My partner and I believe that ship to shore power is provided before any increased activity is allowed at the site.	No
Organisation	Balmain	Object	As residents in the Waterdale apartments across from the proposal we feel we (and all residents in the local area) will be significantly impacted with unreasonable noise, pollution and increased traffic adding to the already unreasonable amounts of local congestion.	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	I object given the already persistent noise levels	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	The most alarming concern identified in Cement Australia's DA application is: More Noise Residents currently struggle with existing noise emissions from Cement Australia's ship operations. Unloading ships is a 24 hour operation over several days and often interferes unreasonably with the comfort and repose of Waterdale residents living in nearby premises. Increasing the number of ship visits will increase the frequency of these existing disturbances. It is neither fair nor just to expose residents to a greater number of days each year where we are forced to suffer these noise disturbances. Other concerns include: More emissions - air pollution Vessels currently run their engines whilst in port to support unloading operations, emitting toxic fumes into our community. The government recently announced the development of Shore Power in the Bays Port precinct to allow working vessels to plug in to electric power. However, the effective implementation of this plan is still some years away. More trucks The increase in throughput capacity will significantly increase the current number of truck movements over the course of the day adding to existing traffic congestion in the area.	No

Personal	Pyrmont	Object	I feel sure the recent move to provide shore power to The Cruise Ship Terminal (at a cost of some millions of dollars) and only 200 metres away from this proposed massive increase in throughput at the cement works appears as stupid and inconsistent to you people as it does to me and any other sentient individual aware of the two proposals existing in juxtaposition. Idea 1: let's clean up the air and reduce noise levels in Balmain/Rozelle. Idea 2: let's more than double the pollutants and noise levels at Glebe Island next door. This isn't a 'Planning Proposal,' it's a mindless, myopic cynical cash-grab. Hardly surprising in NSW, the finest state money can buy.	No
Personal	Pyrmont	Object	I object most strongly to this proposal. The Department of Planning is constantly trying to find ways to use Glebe Island none of which are appropriate to the area. The increase in shipping movement will mean more noise, air and light pollution. It will result in major traffic throughput even though the capacity increase is not to service Sydney Central. There should be a curfew imposed between 10pm and 7am and there should be no use of any equipment of any kind on Saturdays after 12.00pm and absolutely none on Sundays. There should be no use of crane and bucket loading which creates 'impossible to live with' noise pollution. The approval period should be no longer than 5 years. Ship to Shore power should be brought forward to 2023. Once again the NSW Government, The Port Authority and Cement Australia have no thought to the people who live in close proximity to Glebe Island.	No
Personal	Rozelle	Comment	I support White Bay continuing to be a working harbour and am also excited by the Metro project & future promenade. The ships are welcome they need though to be quieter and less polluting. If more ships mean greater noise levels then the proposal needs to be changed. We live directly across from the unloading ships and plant. At times the noise is unacceptable especially at night. This is a great opportunity to have less noisy plant and more environmentally friendly vessels.	No
Personal	Pyrmont	Object	Mr Boris Trochine 10D/2 Bowman st, Pyrmont, NSW 2009 Attn Minister for Planning and Public Spaces / Independent Planning Commission Dear Sir RE: Application No Location Applicant Council Area Consent Authority DA-I886'1 1 Lot 12 Sommersville Road, Rozelle (Lot 12DP 1170710) Cement Australia Pty Ltd Inner West Minister for Planning This is to express my concerns regarding possible increase of annual throughput capacity of cementitious material from 500,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 1,200,000 tpa. My family and I are strongly against those proposals, as the site of the proposed increase of annual throughput capacity of cementitious material from 500,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 1,200,000 tpa is no suitable and is not sustainable for the local population. Glebe Island is only hundreds of meters way from our Evolve building, 1. Increase of capacity wld result into more dust. Dust -this can cause serious lung and general respiratory system health problems, including a severe risk for those who already have asthma. Cement Australia Pty Ltd might argue that all protective measures will be taken place to minimize dust exposure to the locals, nevertheless I would like to underline that particles at a certain size will be exposed anyway due to the winds during operation. These particles can also cause cancer and metabolic disorders. Air pollution is a major problem in many developing countries, including China. We would not want to see Sydney as a city in a developed nation going backward and leaving us and our children with health problems to solve. 2. Water pollution at Glebe Island. We all are fighting these days against environmental pollution. So many boats are already passing through Glebe Island causing huge water pollution. Given that this expansion is a huge problem for the water, fish etc. The above proposal would result into drastic increase in shipping movements. 3. Noise, lights - The port is already quite heavily engaged in anchoring many boats on a weekly and monthly schedule. This can not simply go unnoticed even now as all the residents at Evolve and all nearby witness EVEN MORE the noise and lights coming from the boats at night. They disturb our normal livelihood. Nevertheless, we never complain. Now, with the new expansion the number of the boats is not going to double but triple the issues and impact on us. 4. Unwanted boat accidents- Huge number of vessels will inevitably result into possible accidents. 5. The bigger/expanded plant will operate through out year producing: - Noise pollution as Hundreds more large heavy-duty double bogey trucks per day onto local roads - One or two large ships to be nearly continuously moored at Glebe Island running their engines 24/7 - Rather noisy tugs docking large cargo ships in the middle of the night - All of this will be lasting for many years to come.	No

5. Why all nearby residents have to suffer because Cement Australia Pty Ltd wants to make MORE profit ?
(and this capacity increase is to support non-central Sydney needs).

In my opinion, this is a serious violation of our rights for a clean, normal and civilized livelihood. Why we have to pay the harsh cost of failing health because of the dust and air, noise and light pollution by those making more money ?

Therefore, my family and me are strongly against this "unrealistic" and "backward" proposal. We would encourage government to search for another site for the construction/expansion of capacity. We oppose the proposal of the expansion as the location is unsafe and unsuitable.

I have to also inform you that I don't belong to any political party and don't have any political preferences.

Best Regards
Boris Trochine

Personal	Pymont	Object	I object to this application due to the following negative impacts on our community: - A significant increase in shipping movements which will result in more noise, light and air pollution. The EIS states that the number of visits by ships will increase to 55/annum and the increased capacity requires increased docking time to 48 hours. This will result in 110 days/annum that ships will be at the port which is roughly 30% of the year. - Major increase in traffic throughput despite of the fact that this capacity increase is to support non-central Sydney needs. - While the EIS indicates that there will be no increase in pollution or noise levels that will exceed EPA limits, the current noise levels are not insignificant and was an issue of major concern in the initial application for the facility. The engines that run overnight result in a significant amount of noise. The approval must apply the following conditions:- - Vessel movement curfew between 10:00pm and 6am - No crane and bucket loading - Limit the approval period to a maximum of 12 years - Require ship to shore power within 5 years - That Cement Australia commit to a tangible plan to produce low carbon concrete with higher fly ash content	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	I object to the DA made by Cement Australia. We live close by and have to endure the toxic exhaust fumes and noise emitted by moored ships servicing the Glebe Island silos. Already the ships work 24/7 and on many nights we have to close our bedroom windows to keep out the smell and noise from rusty cranes unloading materials. Any increase in output would exacerbate the problem. Although promised a shore to ship power supply to recharge the ships, this will probably be years away. Why wasn't this work done during the Covid era, when cruise ships were and still are absent from White Bay? The development will also mean additional truck movements, resulting in more traffic congestion in the area and more pollution. Already, living the area is like living on a building site, with constant noise and pollution from nearby tunneling and construction work in connection with the cross city tunnels and road works.	No

Personal	Rozelle	Object	I do not consent to my name and email address being published in a public forum. As a resident I object to the DA application DA-188611 as the application and supporting documents has not adequately considered the following points: • The community consultation process, noise study etc is lacking, numerous residents in the Rozelle area (eg. Reynolds Avenue, Rumsay Street/Lane, Smith Street, Rosser Street) have been excluded or not adequately assessed even though they are as equally close to residents consulted and considered by the noise assessments. These Rozelle residents are directly adjacent the Port and have direct line of sight and in close proximity to existing ship unloading operations and the silos themselves. At the same time, the Department of Planning and Environment consider me as being located close enough to be made aware of the DA by mail. • The noise modelling and sampling does not appear to describe or consider the source of noise generation by ships and unloading which is elevated above the Port ground level and the resultant impact to residential properties which are elevated due to topography (eg. Reynolds Avenue, Rumsay Street/Lane, Smith Street, Rosser Street) and /or are of multi-story construction. All monitoring has been undertaken at street level, with a high potential to be sheltered by the built environment and/or at a lower elevation than the areas as identified in Rozelle which were not consulted, therefore the noise assessment is not reflective of all residents who may or will be impacted. • How has the noise monitoring considered wind conditions? Wind conditions significantly impact noise levels of residential properties in the area. Noise fatigue from noise generated in and around the Port is relieved by favourable wind conditions. However unloading noise is experienced in all conditions due to its close proximity. Due to significant increase in unloading duration & frequency, estimated from 50 days / year to 100 days/ year, this will reduce the residential respite from existing noise resulting in a negative impact to residents. • How does the application consider the future use of the Bays Precinct, particularly with respect to future pedestrians, recreational areas, mixed use areas, residents and businesses? The Bays Precinct activation has begun with the commencement of Sydney Metro West. The Bays precinct is a nominated State Significant Development and should be considered in the DA process since the DA does not nominate an expiry date on the increased capacity operations. • It is noted the economic benefits to the cement and concrete industries, shipping vs road transport. However, it would seem to be overstated or even anecdotal that unless this DA is approved, supply shortages will occur. Many concurrent, high cement demand, major and mega infrastructure projects and development projects have been ongoing in the Sydney metro area for numerous years without supply shortages halting projects and without an increase to throughput at Glebe Island. Anecdotally an issue which has been far more prevalent in these types of projects, which has limited the supply of concrete to construction sites is the availability of ready mix concrete trucks to supply sites with concrete from the batch plant. Not the supply of raw cement. • It appears that the introduction of “quiet ship technology” as a mitigation measure will be left up to the discretion of the shipping owner/ operator. Therefore it should not be included as a mitigation measure, as they may not install this technology. It is also not clear what benefit or noise reduction will be achieved by this technology. • Peak noise generated may not change as a result of increased frequency of operations, however how is noise fatigue and accumulate noise impacts and fatigue being considered? It appears that accumulative noise impacts and noise fatigue to residents is not considered. How is respite from noise at nights considered since ship and associated unloading generating noise will occur 24hrs/ day when in port, and at an increased and longer frequency? Increased throughput will reduce the noise respite provided to residents at night and weekends. • Finally, past use shouldn’t dictate future use. The entire Bays Precinct is slated for transformation. Remaining industrial and port operations must be sympathetic with this future vision for the Bays or else the state significant development will be a failure. Approval of this DA in its current form, without conditions which better serve the surrounding community now and, in the future, particularly around noise, is short sighted. The trend in the Bays area is the decline of continuous heavy port operations, which seems to be aligned with the future vision of the Bays. I hope the Department duly considers the above points and rejects the DA application.	No
Gov Agency	Petersham	Comment	In Council’s response back to DPIE on a letter dated 3 August 2020, a number of traffic and transport issues were raised. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) dated September 2021 by Traffix, for the proposed development does not appear to have addressed most, if not key items raised. Specifically: Truck haulage routes indicate access to and from the development proposed remain unchanged, that is, through James Craig Road and City West Link Road. The ‘Glebe Island Traffic Management Map’ in Appendix E of the TIA also provides alternate routes that appear to link to the White Bay Cruise Terminal and/or Robert Street. Under no circumstances truck access through Glebe Island’s internal roads exiting onto Robert Street will be supported. The SIDRA analysis appear to have incorporated the additional generation anticipated from Multi-use facility, White Bay Cruise Terminal, New Sydney Fish market, and Hanson Concrete Batch Plant. Although these are included in the assessment, impacts from the construction and operational stages of the WestConnex Rozelle Interchange does not appear to have been included in the 2017 survey and traffic modelling as WestConnex construction commenced in 2019. Intersection modelling on three (3) intersections have been provided in the TIA report. The SIDRA modelling layout appears to be based on the existing layout at the time of the report, and not reflecting on the final layout when Rozelle Interchange will be complete. It is noted that the modelling has not included a Saturday midday peak as originally suggested in Council’s earlier comments. A Traffic Management Plan for the Glebe Island Terminal does not appear to address the items raised previously by Council, such as: • Reinstatement of Glebe Island Bridge for active and public transport • Establishment of Bays Precinct, Sydney: The Transformation Strategy proposed foreshore public access area • Development of future light rail links to White Bay	No

Personal	Rozelle	Object	GLEBE ISLAND SILOS THROUGHPUT CAPACITY INCREASE – DA-188611 - Lot 12 Sommersville road Rozelle While there may be some reasoning behind the maintenance of industrial type activities in the Bays area this in no way provides a justification for the more than doubling of such activity and its associated impacts on the surrounding community. It is both inappropriate and short-sighted in terms of the development of the area, including the amenity of Sydney Harbour generally, and, more locally, White Bay Power Station and any future higher density residential developments. More generally, it ignores the historical nature of the area surrounding White Bay and its value to the city's culture. The proposal does not genuinely take account of the overall noise and air pollution that the community is currently exposed to or the impact of current developments that will contribute to such pollution. Noise Levels The proposal should be considered in the context of the existing noise resulting from traffic on the Anzac Bridge, expanding aircraft noise, ship noise from existing shipping and bulk handling activities at Glebe Island and the overseas passenger terminal, ambient noise from the city, as well as the dramatic increase in traffic noise resulting from the WestConnex (both currently and into the future). There will also be additional noise resulting from the extension of rail and ferry services into the area. These things combine to denigrate the health and quality of life of local residents. The proposal states that Cement Australia has limited control over noise emissions from vessels. While there may be steps being taken to try to reduce noise from ships, most of these ships are anything but state of the art. They are generally older vessels and it is questionable just how much noise from their movement on the harbour and in the unloading process. Of course, there will also be a significant increase in the actual number of ships berthing – presumably more than double the current annual number. The section on air pollution also indicates an additional 20,000 vehicle movements per year. This too will necessarily add to the overall noise levels and must be taken into account in combination with all other activities Again the additional noise impact should take account of all combined activities in the surrounding area, both current and future. Air Pollution The documents supporting the proposal purport to dismiss the impact of additional air pollution from the expansion of throughput being minimal in comparison to other pollutants from existing activities in the area. This does not justify adding even more pollutants via truck and ship movements and associated activities. The proposal must be considered in the context of what local residents are already experiencing and will be exposed to in the future as a result of extended road works, the flight path (which is expanding further and further over Rozelle) and other proposed transport modes (rail and ferry). The documents submitted by the proponents note that no local air quality monitoring has been undertaken in the area of the proposed development. Instead, it suggests that monitoring or air quality taken 2km north west of the project site is indicative. This is complete nonsense. The extent of current and future activity in the Rozelle/Bays Area far exceeds anything happening in the area this far to the north west. As stated in my submission on noise pollution, this does not take account of all the existing and future inputs regarding relating to pollution in the area, least of all the closely located 3, three story unfiltered exhaust vents for the West Connex that will all too soon come on line. As anyone who lived in the area when the bushfire smoke invaded Sydney can testify, the pollutants do not just “blow away”. In fact, on at least one occasion during that period Rozelle recorded the highest level of air pollution in the metropolitan area. With the increased air pollution from planes, vehicles using the WestConnex and other localised industrial activity, the air quality of the area will nose dive in no uncertain terms. The Inner West has been treated like a toilet for far too long. There is no case for adding to the deterioration of living conditions in the area.	No
Personal	Neutral Bay	Object	It will cause air and noise pollution	No
Personal	Mona Vale	Object	I object to the proposed development of the Glebe Island Silos Throughput Capacity Increase for the following reasons 1)Environmental impact on the local community; significant increase in air pollution and noise pollution caused by the proposed increase in merchant vessels and other industrial activities 2)Re-Industrialisation of Sydney Harbour; Sydney Harbour and specifically the glebe island area is not equipped to respond to the proposed increased activity. Bringing goods into the centre of a city, to then drive them out of this same area is not only nonsensical, but environmentally damaging. According to data available, it would appear that Cement Australia uses only half of the currently approved 500,000 tonne capacity per annum to support central Sydney, and as such, it is nonsensical to continue to develop Glebe Island in this way. Perhaps moving these operations to a regional port facility would be a better overall long term option for all concerned.	No
Personal	Mona Vale	Object	I strongly object to the proposed development of the Glebe Island Silos Throughput Capacity Increase for the following reasons 1)Environmental impact on the local community; significant increase in air pollution and noise pollution caused by the proposed increase in merchant vessels 2)Re-Industrialisation of Sydney Harbour; Sydney Harbour and specifically the glebe island area is not equipped to respond to the proposed increased activity. Bringing goods into the centre of a city, to then drive them out of this same area is not only nonsensical, but environmentally damaging. According to data available, it would appear that Cement Australia uses only half of the currently approved 500,000 tonne capacity per annum to support central Sydney, and as such, it is nonsensical to continue to develop Glebe Island in this way. Thank you for your consideration.	No

Personal	Balmain	Object	I strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons: • Re-Industrialisation of Sydney Harbour • Environmental impact on the local community • Cumulative Environment Impact of incremental developments	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	I strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons: • Re-Industrialisation of Sydney Harbour • Environmental impact on the local community • Cumulative Environment Impact of incremental developments I am vehemently against this proposal, due to the significant negative impact this will have on the surrounding environment and my community. The air pollution that will be associated with the increase in merchant vessels and associated land traffic (as a result of the increase in cement capacity) will directly cause harm to residents' health. Additionally, the noise pollution associated with the proposed increase will impact my community on a daily basis.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	I wish to strongly object to the proposal to increase the volume of cement from the plant from 500,000 tonnes to 1.2m tonnes. This is virtually a 250% increase in volume of cement which will constitute a massive increase in the amount of shipping into central Sydney bringing in the required materials. In addition there will be a 250% increase in the amount of noise, dust, and pollution in the centre of our city at a time when we are looking to reduce these problems. It is bad enough that in 2022, at a time when every other major city in the world is taking heavy industry out of their city centres, we are adding in more. To then increase the volume of pollution by two and a half times is an enormous backwards step. I assume this is a negotiating strategy to get something that the cement people want, which they will then trade for reducing the volume back to the 500,000 tonnes. Please do not allow this to go through.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	I strongly object to the proposed Glebe Island Silos Throughput Capacity Increase as this will cause a concerning increase in shipping movements which will result in increasing noise, light and air pollution and traffic.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	I live in Pymont just across from this proposed development on Glebe Island. I object to the proposed increase in throughput through Cement Australia's development. The impact on noise, bright light and air pollution were key areas raised by residents as an impact from this proposed development. What Cement Australia proposes is to now make this even worse. Any increase will result in throughput will mean a significant increase in road traffic. The developmnet was supposed to alleviate this. Now we propsoe to increase this. It has been determined that ship movements will not occur between the hours of 10.00am and 6.00am. I fear that this proposed increase in throughput will breach the agreed evening curfew. The development application should remain limited to a maximum of 12 years, not increase further this is the second most densest suburb for residences in Sydney. No crane and bucket loading should occur to minimise the noise likley to result. I ask that this developmnet application not be approved.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	I live in an apartment directly across from this proposed development and object to the increase in throughput through Cement Australia's proposed development. This proposed increase in throughput will result in a significant increase in shipping movements which will result in more noise, light and air pollution to local residents in the Pymont area. Any increase will result also in a significant increase in road traffic which in one of the key reasons that this port development has been proposed. It has been determined that ship movements will not occur between the hours of 10.00am and 6.00am. I feel this proposed increase in throughput will breach the agreed evening curfew. The development application should remain limited to a maximum of 12 years There should remain no crane and bucket loading Ship to shore power should be available within 3 years	No
Organisation	Rozelle	Object	Please see attached submission by the White Bay Stratas Committee who represent some 2,000 Lot Owners and Occupiers of the four residential strata plans in White Bay.	No

Personal	Balmain	Object	The most alarming concern identified in Cement Australia's application is: • More Noise - o Residents currently struggle with existing noise emissions from Cement Australia's ship operations. - o Unloading ships is a 24 hour operation over several days and often interferes unreasonably with the comfort and repose of Waterdale residents living in nearby premises. - o Increasing the number of ship visits will increase the frequency of these existing disturbances. It is neither fair nor just to expose residents to a greater number of days each year where we are forced to suffer these noise disturbances. Other concerns include: • More emissions - air pollution - o Vessels currently run their engines whilst in port to support unloading operations, emitting toxic fumes into our community. - o The government recently announced the development of Shore Power in the Bays Port precinct to allow working vessels to plug in to electric power. However, the effective implementation of this plan is still some years away. • More trucks - o The increase in throughput capacity will significantly increase the current number of truck movements over the course of the day adding to existing traffic congestion in the area.	No
Personal	Balmain	Comment	I object to the increase of the Glebe Island silos throughput capacity due to increase in noise and pollution close to residential areas.	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	I object to this application for several reasons. The area already has significant traffic congestion which will further increase over the next 3 to 4 years as the rail tunnels are built between the city to Parramatta. This further impost will greatly increase congestion. The increase in shipping will have a large environmental impact to the area - noise, cancerogenic from pollutants, dust, noise. The increased movement of trucks to service the facility will have the same impact. The noise generated over 24 hours operation will severely impact the residents of the area and create difficulties for many creating difficulties for sleeping etc. While it is a port area times have changed and there is now a community wide expectation that heavy industry etc should be moved from such residential areas. It is accepted that a working port can bring benefits but this must also be tempered with controlling working hours and pollution and doubling capacity and extending working hours is completely in disregard to this. The area is already poorly maintained and such industry will further impact this. There is a number of suggestions for the Whitebay power station precinct and extending the volumes through the silos will also severely impost future development of this iconic site. The materials being unloaded are all moved elsewhere through many transport corridors and it makes far more sense for these products to be unloaded and distributed from points that are closer to usage. There are few other industries such as this still in the harbour – all have been moved elsewhere so it simply makes no sense to expand in direct contradiction to what has been occurring for the last 20 to 30 years. As we strive to have people interacting with community, as we seek to improve our environment and have people exercise outdoors the popular area of Blackwattle Bay as well as the foreshore around Balmain will be impacted through pollution as well as the unsightly aspects of the additional shipping movements/working hour. I completely disagree with and oppose this expansion.	No
Personal	Rosebery	Object	I object to the inevitable increase in noise, dust and truck movements, if this DA is approved. This would impact residents and small business in the Waterdale complex. My property is used as a psychologist's practice & would be adversely impacted.	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	This proposal will result in the following. Too many ships and trucks resulting in more noise and pollution. In addition there do not appear to be any provisions for climate change offsets.	No

Personal	Pymont	Object	The increase in annual throughput capacity of cementitious material from 500,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 1,200,000 tpa is obviously more than doubling the current capacity. The impacts in relation to noise, traffic and air quality will be unacceptable. It has a knock on effect on the port facility and shipping traffic as well. The proposal will result in an increase of shipping and trucking movements to and from the site to approximately 55 ships and approximately 49,000 trucks per annum. The area around Glebe Island is already struggling with the roadwork that is being undertaken and the roads cannot take additional traffic that this change will bring about. Shipping movements at night are extraordinarily disturbing to local residents and should be avoided at any cost. This development and the analysis of sound levels etc cannot be viewed in isolation. The Fish Market is being redeveloped, the West connex is being constructed and a new metro station is being built. The area is densely populated and is being overwhelmed by pollution in the form of dust, noise and light. Limits need to be put on the operation of the Glebe Island silos. The justification for this increase is "the ongoing construction of numerous large scale infrastructure projects in Sydney, there is an increased demand for cementitious product for sites and development in the Greater Sydney region. " However, we know that the state government is currently reviewing their plans for large scale infrastructure projects. Infrastructure and Cities Minister Rob Stokes confirmed the government was conducting a review into its major projects. He said the government intended to deliver the projects it had promised, but their timing needed to be reconsidered before committing to liabilities reaching into the "tens of billions". "I am being upfront and saying government is looking at all of these major projects right now." This means the basis for the request to increase throughput has been undermined. If approval for an increase in capacity is granted, any approval should be put in place for a limited period of time so that it's impact on the area can be fully understood and reviewed. Approval for the Concrete plant on Glebe Island has been limited by scale, shipping movements, operational timing and noise impacts. The same must apply here.	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	I object to the additional noise, traffic and pollution to my residential area	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	I object to the increase of the Glebe Island silos throughput capacity due to increase in noise and pollution close to residential areas.	No
Personal	Pymble	Object	As an owner of a property in Rosebery Place, Balmain, I object to the proposal of increased throughput capacity for the Glebe Island Silos on the grounds of additional pollution, noise, people and decreased safety of residents in a pocket of residential apartments and houses.	No
Personal	Pymble	Object	We are owners of an apartment in Rosebery Place where our daughter lives. The objection is in to the relation to the extra activity of boats and trucks as well as people required to access the area daily to work in relation to the extra capacity if allowed. It is acknowledged that the area is a working port, but to increase the activity by 1 and 1/2 times will create extra demand on the infrastructure and the environment. The impact of the pollution, be it noise, air , water or visual will impact the health and safety of the people living locally. It will skew the balance of lifestyle and business to a point that it will destroy the harmony and make the area untenable for residents.	No
Personal	Rozelle	Object	I would like to strongly object and condemn the proposed Cement Australia's proposed throughput increase at the white bay cement terminal at Glebe island on the following grounds: Noise The company is currently supplied by an ageing fleet of ships which are noisy, smelly and ugly. Living within 250 m of the ships and also within view I have seen the practices undertaken while these ships are in port. My wife and I have made numerous noise complaints and we have found the process infuriating, frustrating and soul destroying. We have access to a Sydney ports real time complaints number but whenever we use it the complaint is filed and addressed after the event. My concern is that if this process currently used cannot manage the current ships being unloaded then we will have no chance managing many more. Local neighbourhood impacts. I cannot believe that approval has been given to move so much industrialisation into this beautiful residential area. There are so many locations where this work would be more suited, admittedly it might cost more, but if the only driver is money then we have got this wrong. Air pollution We currently experience black soot like deposits all over the outside of our apartment. This is caused by the 24 hour running of the ships engines. It really concerns me that this along with the exhaust stacks from the new tunneling works will greatly exacerbate this problem. In short this proposal will impact on the health of anyone living in this area. I have to say it has a James Hardie ring to it and I would hate to think of the long term effects. This proposal looks to me to be poorly thought through with the only consideration being cost and timeline. We are not living in the sixties anymore so let's stop playing by that set of rules	No
Personal	Rozelle	Object	See attached file: DA SUBMISSION Glebe Island Silos Throughput Capacity Increase.pdf	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	As a local resident with a small child and young family, I would suggest that the increased activity and pollution in the local area due to the Sydney Metro works at 'The Bays' station is already significantly more disruptive and dangerous than would be expected in a heavily populated residential area. The areas surrounding Sydney provide a range of sites where appropriate batch plants could be situated or relocated, and should be considered at alternative locations, however many vendors will oppose this as the ever increasing fuel costs and other factors would further reduce profit margins if journey times between plant and end users are extended. Instead there seems to be a willingness to forego local residents safety.	No

Personal	Balmain	Object	I object to this application on the grounds that it is likely to increase noise at my home. The applicant's own 'independent' noise impact assessment (ERM Consulting report dated 16 November 2021) observed that: - ships are the primary source of unacceptable noise - at times ships already exceed allowable noise limits; and furthermore - the applicant has no power to manage the behaviour of the ships. This is already and unacceptable situation, even with the existing levels of throughput. The applicant cannot control ship noise by its own admission, and further admits that allowable noise levels are being breached already. It stands to reason that if the applicant is allowed to have greater throughput there will be a greater number of unacceptable noise level incidents. ERM notes that there are plans to install noise attenuation features on the ships. However there is no power for the applicant to force them to do so. Therefore it would be highly unreasonable to rely on this as a mitigating factor. Given above, if the application is granted unacceptable noise levels are likely to increase. I therefore request that the application is rejected.	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	Glebe Island Silos Throughput Capacity Increase Application No DA-188611 I strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons: • Re-Industrialisation of Sydney Harbour • Environmental impact on the local community • Cumulative Environment Impact of incremental developments • Health concerns due to cement dust affecting the human respiratory system Re-Industrialisation of Sydney Harbour The increase in cement capacity at the silos would result in many more merchant vessels using Sydney Harbour for the delivery of goods to be trucked elsewhere, thereby adding to the noise and air pollution that is centred on the community surrounding the port. The return of the bad old days of living amongst industry is supported by DAs like this. As each individual DA is approved so the pollution increases and the living standards decrease for residents in surrounding suburbs. It begs the question: Where -is the data to justify the re-industrialisation of the harbour? While many international cities are centralising port activities away from city centres the NSW Government is still accepting this type of DA for Sydney Harbour with no explanation of the reasoning behind it. Future expansion is in Western Sydney and it would be much better served from Port Botany with its state-of-the-art infrastructure designed to keep goods moving. Bringing goods into the centre of a city only to truck them out again is nonsensical. It's the responsibility of State Government and the Department of - Planning & Environment (DPE) to ensure NSW is properly served to the benefit of all and its puzzling to watch this situation continue. Cement Australia already has approval at the silos for 500,000 tonne capacity per annum and, by their own admission, only half of the cement that currently passes through Glebe Island is used in central Sydney near to Glebe Island. The rest is trucked elsewhere. Therefore, CA already has the capacity to deal with a doubling of demand for cement in central Sydney. The logical conclusion is that the additional capacity requested in the DA is to be trucked across Sydney, away from the centre, polluting the environment as it goes. It is absurd to keep supporting this type of activity in Sydney Harbour when there is a fully functioning port in Botany. The Port Authority's attempt to maintain a presence on the harbour would be farcical if it didn't affect the lives of so many. The difference in air quality between Glebe Island/White Bay and other parts of Sydney is considerable. It's not unusual for residents to regularly remove greasy sooty particles deposited on balconies and outdoor living areas. The noise experienced at different times of night and day would be unacceptable in any other residential area so why are these conditions allowed here?	No

In the past, developments in Sydney like Westconnex and Bays West have been used to justify port facilities in the harbour. Bays West will not be developed all in one go and, even if it is, it isn't big enough to warrant its own port. Neither is Westconnex. There is no construction requirement that big in Sydney.

In order to protect their occupancy on the harbour, it looks like the Port Authority is deliberately attracting cement, sand etc. in order to build "a cluster of uses in circular economy" as described to them by a member of the IPC during the Hanson's Cement Batching assessment (See Transcript pages 19 & 20). The question is:

Where is the evidence to support this? ie the independent studies, the data, that conclude a port operation on Sydney Harbour is of benefit to the citizens of NSW?

Leasing Arrangements

Until the future of the port is known, there should be no leases longer than 12 years and that applies to the Cement Australia DA.

Environmental Impact

Pollution

Given the amount of supporting documentation to read and the time allowed for public scrutiny, we have concentrated on our main concerns which relate to noise:

A number of our residents often struggle with noise emissions from current operations. This application seeks a huge increase in the current volumes of ship visits per annum and will mean less and less precious reprieve from noise for residents.

Unloading ships is a 24-hour operation over several days and often interferes unreasonably with the comfort and repose of those living in nearby premises. The closest homes are less than 230m away from these vessels with very little other than water and open space between them.

The current noise protections offered by the EPA's Noise Policy for Industry and the Glebe Island/White Bay Noise Management Policy including the automated noise monitoring stations have technical limitations in the type of noise they record. They are set to identify tonal noise based on 1/3 octave frequency bands. Our experience of noise emissions from the cement ships visiting Glebe Island has demonstrated the regular occurrence of disturbing tones not identified in the 1/3 octave band resulting in ship operations deemed to be compliant despite their disturbing noise emissions.

The EPA's Noise Policy for Industry acknowledges that in some circumstances tones may not be identified using the 1/3 octave band method and narrow band analysis may be required. However, the automated noise monitoring systems used in White Bay and Glebe Island do not actually record narrow bands, so the disturbances are not measured and more importantly not reported by the monitoring systems. This results in a flawed and false determination of noise compliance by vessel operations.

Residents live less than 230m away from where these ships are berthed at Glebe Island. It is not fair nor just to expose residents to a greater number of days each year where they are forced to suffer these noise disturbances. We have several port alternatives such as Port Botany and Port Kembla with facilities that are not in such close proximity to long established residential homes. The additional capacity to satisfy Sydney's demand for this product should be channelled through these alternative port facilities.

Cumulative Effect of Incremental Development

The planning approvals system does not deal well with incremental increases and cumulative impacts of individual approvals.

Many of our past submissions have requested that the cumulative impact of adding a new development to existing operations be measured and assessed before approval is given but the cumulative effect of adding the proposed increase in cement delivery has been ignored. Every additional development brings increased traffic with its associated pollution together with pollution from the operation itself. And every time the cumulative impact is ignored by the DPIE.

The DPE website states:

“As a department, we want to make a positive difference for the people of NSW by ensuring our work and services incorporate the views and perspectives of the community we serve.”

We see little evidence of the DPE making a “positive difference” for the people in our suburb. Currently, Glebe Island & White Bay port is hosting a Metro station/support site and a Westconnex support site whilst running a few port activities. In plan, is the Multi-User Facility (given planning permission with no tenant to fill it), Hanson Cement Batching Facility (with conditions on noise and restrictions on truck movements) and the Western Harbour Tunnel fabrication and support site. Not once has the cumulative effect of this incremental development been measured by our representatives, the Department of Planning & Environment.

If the DPE really wants to “make a positive difference for the people of NSW” there has to be an end to their reliance on EIA assessments provided by the proponent. Instead, the DPE must represent the community by obtaining independent environmental assessments that include the cumulative effect of adding each newly proposed development. A DA applicant would not be in a position to assess the environmental impact of operations outside their responsibility. Only the DPE can do it.

Conclusion

If the Port Authority wishes to continue operating in what is now a significantly populated residential area on Sydney Harbour then the following must apply:

- The Glebe Island/White Bay Noise Management Policy together with the noise monitoring stations be updated to manage and record narrow bands as well as those already recorded

If the Cement Australia (CA) DA is approved there must be:

- A curfew on vessel movements between 10pm and 6am
- The same noise limits as those imposed by the IPC on Hanson CBP for all developments
- A prohibition on crane and bucket unloading
- A 12-year limit on the length of leases

If similar DAs to that submitted by CA are allowed to continue then we expect to see:

- Data to justify the re-industrialisation of Sydney Harbour
- An independent study evaluating the benefit of Glebe Island/White Bay port operations to the citizens of NSW.

We trust our concerns will be taken into consideration and the DA submitted by Cement Australia to increase capacity at Glebe Island/White Bay is rejected.

Personal	Balmain	Object	White Bay is a residential area. This proposal will increase emissions from vessel's engines in port, it will increase the disruption to local residents from noise, and increase the number of truck movements in the area, adding to congestion. NSW needs to realise that Sydney Harbour is no longer an industrial port. Legacy facilities like this cement terminal need to be relocated.	No
Personal	North Ryde	Object	I object to the Development Application by Cement Australia (CA) for increased throughput capacity at the Glebe Island Silos. My husband and I bought a unit at 20 Buchanan St, Balmain in view of moving in soon when we retire. It is very close to the Glebe Island Silos precinct. We will not be moving there should the aforesaid application be granted to Cement Australia as the area will no longer be healthy nor safe to live in. We fear there will be a significant increase in the number of ships coming and going into to White Bay/Glebe Island Silos precinct which will have a considerable environmental impact on its surroundings, hence impacting on our health and others living in the area. We are concern there will be increasing noise and air pollution that will be emitted from ships and trucks that will be frequenting the area. The local traffic congestion in the area is already bad around that area, it will be worsened should the application be approved to go ahead. Please do not pollute White Bay any further. Please keep White Bay clean, green and safe for the children at nearby schools and local residents. Increasing throughput capacity at the Glebe Island Silos will only benefit Cement Australia. Please think of the people living in the area and the daily negative impacts it will have on them. Life will not be healthy living in an industrial polluted environment for the locals living nearby should the application to increase throughput capacity at the Glebe Island Silos be approved.	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	This will be detrimental to the very nature of the site and the emerging commercial and residential hub of the site. NSW and Sydney has done very well to develop the area to suit for high value economic activity and create a very lucrative mixed use economic region for tax payers in the future. Heavily slanting this mix to industrial use destroys the very nature of the area that has taken decades to develop. The environmental impact alone would be enough for the area to take two steps back. This will affect tax payer residents who have already put up with the infrastructure build in the area for well over 5 years now. To now add this to the mix would a burden too far. Government should seriously reconsider what their vision of this very precious area of Sydney is? How do they want to development in the future and how industrial activity as proposed fits into these plans. I would submit we not only need to deny the current plans but also find a way to relocate the whole operation away from this location.	No

Personal	Pymont	Object	PDF submission to be made publicly available separately	No
Personal	North Epping	Object	The most alarming concern identified in Cement Australia's application is: • More Noise o Residents currently struggle with existing noise emissions from Cement Australia's ship operations. o Unloading ships is a 24 hour operation over several days and often interferes unreasonably with the comfort and repose of Waterdale residents living in nearby premises. o Increasing the number of ship visits will increase the frequency of these existing disturbances. It is neither fair nor just to expose residents to a greater number of days each year where we are forced to suffer these noise disturbances. Other concerns include: • More emissions - air pollution o Vessels currently run their engines whilst in port to support unloading operations, emitting toxic fumes into our community. o The government recently announced the development of Shore Power in the Bays Port precinct to allow working vessels to plug in to electric power. However, the effective implementation of this plan is still some years away. • More trucks o The increase in throughput capacity will significantly increase the current number of truck movements over the course of the day adding to existing traffic congestion in the area.	No
Personal	Balmain	Object	I do not support this application. This will significantly impact traffic and noise pollution in the area. Please consider the local residents given everything else that has been approved recently to the detriment of the area eg westconnex tunnelling, concrete processing plant. There are so many residents living close by, this level of operation is much better suited to somewhere less densely populated.	No
Organisation	Pymont	Object	PDF submission to be made publicly available separately	No
Personal	Pymont	Object	This proposal whilst making commercial sense for Cement Australia (CA) has absolutely no upside for locally affected communities. Vessel Movements Market demand will influence the number of potential ship movements nonetheless the potential of a further 20 vessels represents a substantial 40% increase in CA ships visiting Glebe Island. On its own this might be enough of a risk for local residents however if we add the cumulative impacts of vessel movements from the PA's MUF, the Hanson Concrete Batching Plant (CBP) and cruise ships there will be little or no respite from shipping movements. Cumulative impacts have been thoroughly traversed in submissions made with respect to the PA's REF and the Hanson EIS-SSD8544 however it is important to restate those impacts:- • noise • air quality • light spill Traffic Impacts The increase in capacity of the CA facility is planned to support broader Sydney needs rather than any central Sydney need. The impacts of increased traffic resulting from this proposal should be prudently evaluated together with those of the MUF and Hanson's CBP. Regular gridlock on ANZAC bridge will be further compounded by the notable increase in truck movements from not only this proposal but from the MUF and Hanson's CBP. Proposal Equity In its decision on the Hanson EIS – SSD8544, the Independent Planning Commission conditioned Hanson loading and unloading of ships to the hours of 6:00am to 10:00pm. I believe Cement Australia should not enjoy a commercial advantage over Hanson by being allowed to operate 24/7 and therefore any approval of this proposal should be similarly conditioned.	No