

██████████
██████████
Pymont
NSW 2009

1 February 2022

Submission on draft Sub-precinct Master Plans for the Pymont Peninsula

Noise is a major issue in the context of developments on the Pymont Peninsula. Page 1 of the *Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy Implementation* document states that a technical review of the noise issue was prepared “to help inform the implementation of the PPPS”. That review is *Technical Document 14, the Pymont Noise Study*, prepared by GHD Pty Ltd and dated 15 October 2021.

What an unsatisfactory review it is. Presumably that is the result of very specific instructions given to GHD Pty Ltd by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE).

Section 3.2 of the *Pymont Noise Study* is entitled ‘Glebe Island and White Bay Port’. It largely regurgitates key points from the *Port Noise Policy* produced by the NSW Port Authority (PA). Unfortunately, the PA’s policy is self-serving and cynical. It has just one purpose – to protect the narrow commercial interests of the PA and its customers. It provides no protection to communities surrounding the port.

The DPIE knows this. Self-evidently, it does not care. It obviously suits the DPIE to effectively abdicate all responsibility for monitoring and regulating port-related noise to the PA. That enables the DPIE to distance itself from adverse outcomes for local residents while enjoying the PA’s profits.

Remarkably, section 3.2 of the *Pymont Noise Study* makes no reference to the decision of the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) regarding the Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant and Aggregate Handling Facility (SSD 8554). That decision was made on 23 July 2021, three months prior to the *Pymont Noise Study*. This omission is remarkable for two reasons. First, because section 3.2 refers to the Hanson facility, and secondly, because the IPC decision deals directly with the matters raised in section 3.2.

Hanson, the applicant in SSD 8554, relied on the same spurious ‘business as usual/active port’ argument that is used in the PA’s *Port Noise Policy* and referenced in the *Pymont Noise Study*. The IPC, a panel of independent experts, rejected that argument. It recognised “the urban transformation over the past two decades in Pymont” and said that port activities have to be balanced against “the growing urban development in the precinct”.

As a result, the IPC “imposed stringent conditions to reduce the impacts arising from the development to enable better integration with the current and future urban development”. The conditions imposed include lower noise limits than those in the PA’s *Port Noise Policy* and a curfew on vessel movements.

Significantly, Hanson had sought to avoid any meaningful noise mitigation measures on the basis that apartments at Jacksons Landing in Pymont were required to provide for noise attenuation. Like the PA before it, Hanson argued that local residents could avoid excessive noise by keeping their doors and windows closed all the time.

This crazy and morally dubious suggestion was rejected by the IPC. It specifically imposed a curfew on Hanson. In spite of overwhelming submissions from the local community, the PA refuses to countenance a curfew on any of its operations and there is no curfew in its self-serving *Port Noise Policy*.

It is disheartening to see that page 32 of the *Pymont Noise Study* references the design of buildings in Jacksons Landing in the context of noise mitigation without any mention of the IPC decision and its discussion of that precise issue.

It is disturbing, but not surprising, that both the *Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy Implementation* and the *Pymont Noise Study* simply ignore the IPC’s inconvenient decision on the Hanson facility. It speaks volumes about the DPIE’s contempt for both the IPC and the public.

Local residents have reached the point where they now assume that all the “technical reviews” undertaken in relation to the Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy, and indeed the entire ‘consultation’ process, are just spin to cover what the DPIE intends to implement come what may. Sadly, there is no accountability.