EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

Notice is hereby given that an **Extraordinary Meeting** of the Leichhardt Municipal Council will be held in the Council Chambers, Leichhardt Town Hall, 107 Marion Street, Leichhardt on **Tuesday 5 September 2006 at 7pm.**

Peter Gainsford
Acting General Manager
1 September 2006

Business:

Item 1: WHITE BAY CEMENT TERMINAL

LEICHHARDT MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

REPORT

DIVISION: GENERAL MANAGER

SUBJECT: ITEM 1 – MODIFIED PLANS FOR PROPOSED WHITE BAY CEMENT TERMINAL

FILE REF:

DATE: 1 SEPTEMBER 2006

WORD PROCESSING REF:

Leichhardt Council was notified by the Department of Planning (dated 15 August 2006) that the applicant had decided to modify its plans for the proposed Cement Terminal at White Bay and set 1 September 2006 as the deadline for a response to these modified plans.

This move gave Council less than 2 weeks to consider major changes to the Cement terminal proposal and respond in any detailed way. Council's Building and Development Committee is the proper Council body to consider these plans in order to adequately respond to the proposed changes.

Council has written to the Department of Planning advising them that the timeframe given is insufficient to give due consideration and comment on the proposal. Council also requested an extension of time to 19 September in order to allow Council to make a detailed submission after consideration by the Building & Development Committee at their meeting set for 15 September 2006.

In response, the Department of Planning has responded by saying that they cannot guarantee that the proposal will not be determined prior to 19 September 2006.

The Mayor has called this Extraordinary Meeting to enable Council to determine a position on the amended plans for the proposed White Bay Cement Terminal.

LEICHHARDT MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

REPORT

DIVISION:	ENVIRONMENTAL AND COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT
SUBJECT:	WHITE BAY CEMENT TERMINAL
AUTHOR:	KAREN JONES, MANAGER ASSESSMENTS
FILE REF:	F06/00039
DATE:	2 SEPTEMBER 2006
WORD PROCESSING REF:	F:\Manager - Assessments\Reports\Cement Terminal.doc

DIRECTOR'S SUMMARY - ORGANISATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications:	NIL
Policy Implications:	NIL
Strategic Plan Objective:	NIL
Staffing Implications:	NIL
Notifications:	NIL
Other Implications:	NIL

1. BACKGROUND

Council prepared a response to a proposal from ICL for a cement terminal at White Bay on 28 March 2006.

Council has now received notification of a revised development proposal for White Bay. The original application proposed the construction of a cement terminal on the site. The cement terminal was to have a design capacity of 500,000 tonnes with an expected annual bulk product throughput of 360,000 tonnes. The cement terminal will handle dry cement only which will be received in bulk vessels.

The applicant has submitted a revised proposal that was prepared in response to the submissions received during the exhibition period.

2. RECOMMENDATION

That Council make a formal submission to the Minister objecting to the proposal on the grounds set out in Section 7 of this report.

3. SITE & LOCALITY DESCRIPTION

The site is located in White Bay which forms part of the Parramatta River and Sydney Harbour Catchment. White Bay is a tidal estuarine embayment of Parramatta River / Sydney Harbour and is located in the centre of the catchment approximately 2 km west of the city.

The bay has a small heavily urbanised catchment, with an area of 1.5km^2. It includes residential areas of Balmain and Rozelle, as well as the port and employment area around the bay. The footprint of the bay has changed over time due to reclamation. The site is located along the south western foreshore of the bay and is located on reclaimed land.

The site is located at Wharf 1 White Bay. The site varies in elevation from 3m to 5m AHD with the site sloping east towards White Bay. Located to the north of the site is a high wire mesh fence, a rail corridor and a dust/noise barrier. The White Bay Power State is located to the west and a concrete wharf is located along the southern boundary. Security fencing surrounds the overall wharf. The site is mostly vacant and undeveloped with the majority sealed with concrete and loose gravel.

Sydney Ports Corporation owns the berths and associated land at White Bay including the subject site. Independent Cement and Lime (ICL) have signed an agreement with the Sydney Ports Corporation for the lease of 1.33 hectares of land for the construction of the cement terminal.

The documentation submitted with the proposal indicates that the development at White Bay is aimed to consolidate ICL operations in NSW. The White Bay port facility will receive deliveries of cement from ICL's Port Adelaide plant. It is proposed to store the cement at White Bay before transferring it by road to retailers, concrete batching plants and other end users.

ICL have listed the following consequences should the proposal not proceed:

- *An independent, secure supplier of cement would not be available in NSW;*
- *Significant investment from ICL in Victoria and NSW would be put at risk;*
- *Economic benefit to the regional economy as a result of direct and indirect income would not be created;*
- *Alterations to the visual amenity and ambient noise of the area would not occur; and*
- *Local infrastructure improvement would not occur.*

4. ORIGINAL PROPOSAL

The original application proposed the construction of a cement terminal on the subject site that had a design capacity of 500,000 tonnes with an expected annual bulk product throughput of 360,000 tonnes. The cement terminal would handle dry cement only which will be received in bulk via vessels. Specifically, the application proposed:

- A terminal to provide for unloading of self discharging and standard bulk vessels of up to 30,000 tonne capacity.
  The application proposed 12 shipments of cement in the first year of operation and an increase to 18 shipments by the fifth year of operation. The applicant has indicated that the number of shipments would be maintained at 18 thereafter.

- A purpose built *Siwertell* unloader and closed screw conveyor.
  For standard vessels visiting the site, a *Siwertell* unloader and closed screw conveyor was to be used to transport the cement from the vessel into an enclosed hopper. The enclosed hopper is used to fill two pneumatic pressure vessels for closed pipe conveying of the cement to the storage dome. The *Siwertell* has an unloading capacity of 700 tonne per hour and it includes noise and dust suppression controls. The applicant has indicated that the use of the *Siwertell* will cease during rain events or when the wind speed exceeds 20 knots.

- A series of pipes to convey the cement.
  For self discharging vessels, two 400mm-diameter pipes used to pneumatically transport the bulk cement from the ship to the storage dome would be provided. These pipes are an alternative way (to the *Siwertell* unloader) of transporting the cement from the vessel to the storage dome. The pipes were to be connected to the ship and compressors on board the vessel will pump the cement at a flow rate up to 400 tonne per hour per pipe.

  The pipes were to be located beneath the ground at a depth of 1m or along the wharf face. The pipes will be above ground at the ship connection and at the discharge into the storage dome.

- A 40,000 tonne capacity storage dome to be constructed on the site.
  The proposed storage dome had a maximum capacity of 40,000 tonne. The height of the dome was approximately 30m and the diameter was approximately 48 metres.

- Four dispatch silos to provide for bulk dispatch into sealed road tankers.
  Four 300 tonne silos were proposed with the application. The silos were approximately 33m high and had a 4.5m diameter. Pipes and valves were to be installed to allow the controlled filling of the silos from the main storage dome.

  The dispatch silos were located above the weighbridges where tankers will be loaded with bulk cement. The silos utilised two 300mm load spouts to fill each tanker. Cement was to be discharged from the silos using air from blowers to discharge into sealed tankers under gravity.

- A warehouse to provide storage of bagged product.
  The cement bagging process would be conducted within the storage warehouse. Cement was to be conveyed to the silos adjacent to the warehouse. The cement would then be transferred into automated bagging equipment within the warehouse. This equipment will produce a range of bagged products and will place the filled bags onto pallets where they will be stored within the warehouse.

  The proposed warehouse was to be 12m high, 90m long and 40m wide with an area of 3,600m^2.

- Two silos adjacent to the on-site warehouse where products will be bagged and palletised for distribution.
  Two bag silos were to be located adjacent to the warehouse which will supply the cement bagging equipment within the warehouse. Each silo was 25m high.

- Compressor building and motor control room.
  The compressor room provides air for the pneumatic conveying of cement. The Motor Control Room is an electrical switch room that controls the facility.

- Weighbridge.
  Two 28m long weighbridges with a maximum weight capacity of 80 tonne.

- Employee parking spaces and vehicle movements
  All vehicles visiting the site will use James Craig Road and Sommerville Road. Vehicles will utilise the signalised intersection of The Crescent and James Craig Road and then travel towards the site using Sommerville Road.

  12 employee parking spaces proposed for the site.

  In the first year of operation it is estimated that there was to be a maximum of 29 trucks per day distributing bulk cement and bagged cement. The number of trucks would then increase to 43 per day in the fifth year of operation.

- External lighting
  The facility will be lit during night-time hours. The lighting used will include office lighting, warehouse lighting, access road lighting, wharf lighting during ship discharge and weighbridge/loading lighting.

- Hours of operation
  The application proposes 24 hour operation of the cement terminal with two shifts of 12 hours each for the bulk cement area and two shifts of 8 hours each for the warehouse area.

- Number of employees
  A maximum of 10 employees will be on the site during any one shift.

- Waste Disposal
  The application indicates that the facility would be designed in accordance with Sydney Water requirements so that effluent systems will be connected to the existing sewer system.

  The application also outlines how the construction phase of the development will be managed. This is summarised in the following:

- Construction hours
  The application proposes heavy vehicle access and noisy construction activities to be undertaken between 7am and 6pm Monday to Saturday (excluding Public Holidays) unless otherwise agreed with the Department of Environment and Conservation.

  The expected construction period is approximately 12 months.

- Storage dome construction
  The storage dome was to be constructed by placing a fabric form to the foundation and inflated over the tope of construction equipment and stockpiled equipment used to build the dome. Blowers then operate continuously for up to 2 months to maintain the proper shape until enough materials are in place to make the dome self supporting.

- Construction drainage
  Construction site drainage works will be carried out in accordance with Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (DUAP), Managing Urban Stormwater, 1998.

- Construction employment
  The application suggests that approximately 50 people will be employed during the construction period.

- Construction vehicles and plant
  Construction vehicles will access the site via James Craig Road and Sommerville Road.

The type of plant to be used during the construction of the proposal includes excavators, cranes up to 150 tonne, fork lifts, mobile work platforms, portable welding plants, piling rigs, concrete pumps and spray equipment.

- Construction Environment Management Plan
  The construction of the cement terminal will include the implementation of a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). The CEMP will outline the construction activities and techniques to be utilised. A program detailing the schedule of construction activities will also be included.

5. REVISED PROPOSAL

The following is an outline of the revised proposal:

- Ship
  A ship will be used to transport cement from Adelaide and Melbourne to Sydney. ICL will contract vessels with a 20,000 tonne capacity for the transportation. The applicant has indicated that one ship will berth at White Bay Berth 3 at any given time.

  A 20,000 tonne ship will take approximately 24 hours to unload. An estimate of the ship operating costs to ICL for remaining berthed for an extra 8-16 hours is up to $27,000 per day pro rata.

  The applicant states that there will be 12 shipments of cement in the first year of operation and this will gradually increase to approximately 18 shipments in the 5th year.

- Gantry and Product Pipelines
  A 5m wide, 9.5m high structure is to be located on White Bay Berth 3. This structure will hold 4 x 400mm diameter pipes which will pneumatically transport the cement from the ship to the silo. These pipes are to be located beneath the ground to a depth of 1m or along the wharf face.

  The installation of this structure will require the use of cranes and hand tools. The existing concrete surface will be cut as needed to conceal the pipes below ground for the majority of their length. The pipes are to resurface near the silo.

- Silo
  A 35,000 tonne capacity inverted cone silo is proposed. The height of the silo is approximately 55m and the diameter is approximately 30m. The silo is to be self emptying and will house 2 x 300mm load spouts to fill two trucks at any one time.

  The foundations of the silo will be installed using excavators and rock-breakers. Concrete trucks, pumps, piling equipment, slip forming equipment, cranes and hand held tools are to be used in its construction.

- Compressor and Motor Control Centre
  The compressors and motor control centre are incorporated inside the sole within a separate acoustics room. It is proposed to incorporate acoustic treatment of doors and internal walls to reduce noise from the compressors, which are used to provide low-pressure air for the silo aeration.

- Weighbridges
  There are 2 x 28m weighbridges with a maximum weight capacity of 80 tonne. The weighbridges are located underneath the silo.

- Employee Parking Spaces and Vehicle Movements
  The applicant proposes that site access be via James Craig Road and Sommerville Road. Vehicles will utilise the signalised intersection of The Crescent and James Craig Road and then travel towards the site using Sommerville Road. Sommerville Road connects to the port and employment developments in White Bay to James Craig Road. No access will occur via Roberts Street.

  ICL propose to use pneumatic trucks that carry up to 30 tonnes per load for semi trailers and 45 tonnes for B-doubles. The anticipated truck movements start at 58 per day in the first year and increases to 86 movements per day by the 5th year of operation.

  The office building will consist of tilt-up pre-cast concrete panel walls with a 'color-bond' metal roof. A total of 7 car parking spaces are to be provided on site.

- External Lighting
  The facility will be lit during night-time hours. The lighting used will include office lighting, warehouse lighting, access road lighting, wharf lighting during ship discharge and weighbridge/loading lighting.

- Hours of Operation
  The cement terminal is to operation 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

- Number of Employees
  The maximum number of staff during any one shift will be 6.

- Waste Disposal
  The application indicates that the facility will be designed in accordance with Sydney Water requirements so that effluent systems will be connected to the existing sewer system.

- Initial Site Preparation
  Preliminary works will involve the removal of the existing concrete using large excavators, levelling the ground using a bulldozer, compactor/roller and a grader.

- Construction Compound and Temporary Works Area
  A construction compound and temporary lay down areas will be required. Each area will be 20m x 20m and will include temporary cabins to be used as site offices and amenities, parking for construction staff, secure storage for tools, receiving area for incoming vehicles and security fencing. The construction compound will be used for the storage of various components, fuels and materials required for the construction phase.

- Construction Drainage, Effluent Disposal and Waste Management
  The applicant has stated that the construction site drainage works will be carried out in accordance with the Landcom publication, *Managing Urban Stormwater: Volume 1 Soils and Construction, 2004*.

- Construction Employee Numbers
  The applicant has estimated that at the peak of construction approximately 50 people will be employed.

- Construction Access
  The applicant proposes that site access be via James Craig Road and Sommerville Road. Vehicles will utilise the signalised intersection of The Crescent and James Craig Road and then travel towards the site using Sommerville Road. Sommerville Road connects to the port and employment developments in White Bay to James Craig Road. No access along Roberts St.

- Construction Plant
  The following types of Construction Plan will be used: excavators, cranes, fork lifts, mobile work platforms, portable welding plants, piling rigs, concrete pumps and spray equipment and rock breakers.

- Construction Traffic Movements
  The applicant has suggested that a total of 30 vehicle movements will be expected during site establishment, 50 vehicle movements during the construction of the silo and weighbridge and 40 vehicle movements during the construction of the pipeline,. The applicant has not clarified whether these vehicle movements are on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis.

- Construction Time Frame
  It is estimated that the construction period will be 18 months.

- Construction Hours
  The applicant has indicated that work will be carried out from 7am to 6pm Monday to Friday, 8am to 1pm Saturdays or 7am to 1pm on Saturdays if inaudible at nearby residential properties. No construction is to occur on Sundays or public holidays unless approved by the DEC.

  For a 12 week period during the construction of the silo there will be a requirement for 24 hour continuous operation of the concrete pour. The main activity will comprise of trucks delivering concrete to the site. Construction is scheduled to take 18 months before completion.

The following table provides a comparison of the original proposal and the revised proposal. The differences are highlighted.

Original	**Revised**
A terminal to provide for unloading of self discharging and standard bulk vessels of up to 30,000 tonne capacity.	A terminal to provide for unloading and self discharging and standard bulk vessels of up to 20,000 tonne capacity.
12 shipments of cement in the first year of operation and increase to 18 shipments by the 5th year of operation.	12 shipments of cement in the first year of operation and increase to 18 shipments by the 5th year of operation.
A purpose built Siwertell unloader and closed screw conveyor.	A 5m wide, 9.5m high structure is to be located on Berth 3.
2 x 400mm diameter pipes to transport the cement from the ship to the storage dome.	4 x 400mm diameter pipes to pneumatically transport the cement from the ship to the silo.
40,000 tonne capacity storage dome. The dome is approximately 30m high and 48m in diameter.	35,000 tonne capacity inverted cone silo. The height of the silo is approximately 55m and the diameter is approximately 30m. The silo is to be self emptying and will house 2 x 300mm load spouts to fill two trucks at any one time.
4 x 300 tonne silos. Silos are 33m high and 4.5m in diameter.	Deleted.
Warehouse which is 12m high, 90m ling and 40m wide. Has an area of 3,600m^2.	Deleted
2 x 25m high silos for cement bagging adjacent warehouse.	Deleted
Compressor building and motor control room.	Compressor building and motor control room.
2 x 28m weighbridges with maximum capacity of 80 tonne.	2 x 28m weighbridges with maximum capacity of 80 tonne.
12 employee parking spaces.	7 employee parking spaces.
58 truck movements per day increasing to 86 truck movements per day by the 5th year of operation.	58 truck movements per day increasing to 86 truck movements per day by the 5th year of operation.
External lighting	External lighting
24 hour operation.	24 hour operation.
Maximum of 10 employees per shift.	Maximum of 6 employees per shift.
Waste Disposal facility.	Waste Disposal facility.
Construction hours 7am-6pm Monday to Saturday. 24 hour construction activity over 2 months for the construction of the storage dome.	Construction hours 7am-6pm Monday to Friday. 8am-1pm Saturdays. 24 hour construction activity over 3 months for the construction of the silo.
Approximately 50 people employed during construction.	Approximately 50 people employed during construction.
Anticipated construction period 12 months	Anticipated construction period 18 months

6. ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979
Part 3A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 applies to specific projects identified by a State Environmental Planning Policy. The proposed development is located on a site that is identified in Map 6B in Schedule 2 of the State Environmental Planning Policy – Major Projects. Therefore Part 3A f the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 applies and the Minister is the consent authority,

Section 75F(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 requires the Director-General to prepare Environmental Assessment requirements for the applicant to comply with during the preparation of an application, In this case, the Director-General has listed requirements which need to be considered as part of the proposal. In the report dated 28 March 2006, Council assessed the original proposal against these requirements.

This current report assesses the revised project against these requirements.

Assess air quality impacts, particularly in relation to particles
The applicant has provided a revised Air Quality Assessment to accompany the revised proposal.

Council in the assessment of the original proposal recommended that the applicant be required to prepare an air quality management plan in accordance with the Environmental Assessment. The air quality management plan is to be prepared with a view to achieving compliance with the emission standards prescribed by the NSW DEC Impact Assessment Criteria including the *Approved Methods and Guidance for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales 2005* and the Protection of the Environment Operations (Clean Air) Regulation 2002. The air quality management plan is to be prepared prior to commencement of works on the site.

The applicant responded to this recommendation by stating that an Environmental Management Plan is likely to be established for the construction period which will incorporate air quality monitoring and performance reporting. This does not address Council's concerns in relation to the operation characteristics and air quality management of the development.

The applicant has also provided a modified project air quality assessment with the revised proposal. The following is an extract from the recommendations of this report:

ICL will develop an air quality management plan as part of the operational environmental management plan. The plan should include the following:

- *Stack emissions monitoring*
- *Complaints handling*
- *Minimal emissions management practices*
- *General operational particulate mitigation measures including a silo management system, displaced air being vented to suitable arrestment plant, ceasing silo filling is emissions of particulate matter are visible from ducting, incorporating interlocks into the plant control system for dust collectors, storing dusty waste in closed containers, undertaking regular maintenance of on site fabric filter dust collectors, undertaking regular sweeping vacuuming of operation areas.*

The applicant's response is inconsistent with the recommendations of the modified project air quality assessment. The applicant has suggested that air quality will be monitored during the construction phase only whereas the report recommends continual monitoring and adoption of processes to manage air quality for the development at all stages, including operational stage.

<u>Assess noise impacts, particularly due to the proximity of the proposed development to sensitive receptors</u>
Council previously engaged Atkins Acoustics as an independent acoustic consultant to provide advice on noise issues associated with the proposal and the potential noise impacts arising at nearby developments. Given the Department of Planning's timeframe to comment on the revised proposal Council was unable to seek the services of Atkins Acoustics.

With the original proposal, Council raised concerns in relation to the level of information and detail provided in the noise assessment including sleep disturbance effects, demonstration of compliance with the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan, failure to address the requirements of the Department of Environment and Conservation Industrial Noise Policy and identification of the extent of the catchment area that would be exposed to the noise impacts.

In response the applicant has provided a modified project acoustic assessment. This assessment concludes that the original Environmental Assessment Noise Assessment provides recommendations most of which still apply for both construction and operational noise. It also concludes that the proposal complies with the NSW Government's Industrial Noise Policy and the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan.

As mentioned previously, insufficient time has been given to assess the modified project acoustic assessment thoroughly and therefore it is unknown whether the concerns of Council have been satisfactorily addressed.

It should be noted that the revised proposal includes 4 pipes to transport cement whereas the earlier proposal was for 2. Therefore it is assumed that the noise generated from the extra pipes would be greater than the original proposal.

Assess transport and traffic generation

The number of proposed truck traffic movements remains unchanged between the original and revised proposals. The number of employee car parking spaces has been reduced from 10 to 7. Council previously raised the following issues with the original proposal:

Internal roads to comply with Australian Standards.
Applicant's response – noted.

All road users to be catered for in the proposal
Applicant's response – James Craig Road allows for pedestrians and cyclists with a link to Victoria Road at the western end of the bridge. No unauthorised access is permitted along Sommerville Road to the site.

Bicycle Parking to be arranged for staff.
Applicant's response – A bicycle parking area is to be included in the proposal.

Upgrading the Zebra Crossing at James Craig Road and The Crescent to a signalised pedestrian crossing, incorporated with the signalised intersection.
Applicant's response – This requirement is not within the scope of works for the proposal.

Traffic volume data should be upgraded to 2006 figures.
Applicant's response – The applicant has reviewed recent traffic data collected on behalf of Sydney Ports Corporation (November 2005) and sees little benefit is remodelling.

James Craig Road heavy vehicle capacity
Applicant's response – This section of road is managed by the NSW Maritime and is an RTA approved B-double route.

All traffic generated during the construction phase is to use the main arterial road network.
Applicant's response – This is intended to occur and will be a requirement of the site construction environmental management plan.

Management of arrival of heavy vehicles
Applicant's response – Safe timing of truck movements during the construction phase can be specified in the construction environmental management plan. Staggering truck arrivals during the operational phase is likely to naturally occur as having heavy vehicles standing on site is inefficient.

Consideration of visual impacts

Council previously raised concerns in relation to the proposed dome and the hindrance of views to the White Bay Power Station and other land marks. It was Council's opinion that the height and diameter of the proposed dome would obstruct views currently experienced by local residents, views from the waterway and beyond. Council also suggested that the massing and shape of the dome meant that the opportunities for visual penetration through the site are either removed or significantly restricted.

The applicant responded by replacing the dome structure with a silo and relocating it further southwest into the site closer to the White Bay Power Station. The applicant has also provided a modified project visual assessment.

The height has been increased from the 30m proposed with the dome to 55m propose with the silo. The footprint (or diameter) has been reduced from 48m proposed with the dome to 30m proposed with the silo.

As a result the height of the proposal is more dominating. Concern is still raised over the visual impact of the silo when viewed from Robert Street, Batty Street and Batty Street Park as it dominates the skyline.

More importantly, the relocation of the silo has had the effect of providing for a dominant, adverse and overwhelming visual impact for people travelling west on the City West Link, Victoria Road and Johnston Street. This impact is considered to be significant and unacceptable. Appendix A includes plans illustrating the visual impact of the development.

Consideration of water cycle management, including water consumption and recycling

It was Council's opinion that the applicant has not addressed this requirement with the original proposal.

The applicant has not responded to this concern with the revised proposal.

Describe potential impacts of any water release from the site

The revised application does not proposed to change any of the water release mitigation measures proposed in the original assessment.

Soil management, particularly in relation to any soil contamination, potential or actual Acid Sulfate Soils and any fill requirements should be discussed

The original proposal recommended that a soil analysis and geotechnical anaylsis should be undertaken during the detailed design stage of the project. Council was of the opinion that these studies should be undertaken as part of the Environmental Assessment given that the outcomes of these studies could influence the design, location and suitability of the development.

The applicant has responded by stating that a soil analysis and geotechnical analysis would serve any value during the planning process. These issues will be addressed prior to construction for operational purposes and in addition ICL has historical data on previous geotechnical assessments in the area.

This response is considered to be inadequate given that it fails to suitable regard to the matters of consideration for the development.

Consideration of waste management and the principles of "reduce, reuse, recycle"
The applicant stated with the original proposal that the cement terminal has been designed as a closed system where no waste will be produced or will remain on site. Council considered this to be unrealistic to expect that the operation of the facility will not general any waste at all.

The applicant has responded by stating that solid waste during operation will include putrescible, domestic and inert debris which will be recycled where possible or disposed of at a licensed landfill site.

This response does not satisfy the requirement of a waste management plan and does not address the principles of "reduce, reuse, recycle."

Identification of potential hazards and risk implications of the proposed development
Council previously requested the provision of an environmental risk analysis that identifies potential environmental impacts associated with the project (construction and operation), proposed mitigation measures and potentially significant residual environmental impacts after the application of proposed mitigation measures.

The applicant has stated that this was done with the original proposal.

Consideration of heritage impacts
Council previously raised the following issues with the original proposal:

Project inconsistent with current industrial landscape, characteristed by open wharfage
Applicant's response – Having regard to the conclusions reached in the modified visual analysis the applicant states that the proposal is acceptable.

Impact on rejuvenation of White Bay Power Station as set out in the conservation management plan
Applicant's response – The relocation and the redesign of the proposal results in a lesser impact on the White Bay Power Station.

Provision of heritage guidelines or specific requirements for project.
Design considerations and protection provisions; no discussion or justification of the chosen placement, location, size, materials and colours.
Applicant's response – During the exhibition period the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority are of the opinion that the proposal does not impact on the White Bay Power Station and therefore the application should be approved. The applicant has not considered colours or materials of the proposal silo at this stage.

Council advises that the comments from other government departments (referred to by the applicant) were based on the original scheme and not the revised proposal currently being considered. In providing their response to Council's concerns that applicant has failed to undertake an adequate heritage assessment of the revised proposal and as a consequence the impacts of the proposal on the White Bay Power Station are not known.

Also, the applicant has not given due consideration to the materials and colours to be used in the proposed structures. The use of materials and colours is important factor in determining the impact that the proposal may have on the surrounding heritage items.

The applicant has failed to provide a revised heritage assessment to accompany the revised proposal. Reliance on the heritage assessment recommendations of the original proposal is not possible given the significant design changes. Therefore, it is considered that a revised heritage assessment that accurately reports on the revised proposal be prepared and given due consideration before determination of the application.

Consideration of flora and fauna on, in or adjacent to the proposed development
The flora and fauna assessment submitted with the original application stated that no flora and fauna species or their habitat or vegetation communities are likely to be lost form the local area as a result of the proposed development.

Provisions of relevant environmental planning instruments are considered

State Environmental Planning Policy No. 11 – Traffic Generating Developments
The applicant with the original proposal failed to identify that SEPP 11 applies to the development.

The applicant has responded by stating that the consent authority is responsible for determining whether SEPP 11 applies to the proposal. It is noted that the application has been considered by the Sydney Regional Advisory Committee (on behalf of the RTA). However, Council has not received any clarification from the Department of Planning as to whether SEPP 11 applies to the proposal and whether due consideration has been given.

State Environmental Planning Policy No. 33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development
The preliminary screening tests provided in the original Environmental Assessment concluded that the proposed development is not hazardous or an offensive industry and therefore SEPP 33 does not apply. This is considered to be satisfactory.

State Environmental Planning Policy No. 55 – Remediation of Land
The original proposal recommended that a soil analysis and geotechnical anaylsis should be undertaken during the detailed design stage of the project.

The applicant has responded by stating that a soil analysis and geotechnical analysis would serve any value during the planning process. These issues will be addressed prior to construction for operational purposes and in addition ICL has historical data on previous geotechnical assessments in the area.

This response is considered to be inadequate given that it fails to suitable regard to the matters of consideration for the development.

State Environmental Planning Policy No. 56 – Sydney Harbour Foreshores and Tributaries
This State Environmental Planning Policy was repealed. The applicant acknowledges this.

State Environmental Planning Policy – Major Projects
The proposal is located on a site that is identified in Map 6B in Schedule 2 of SEPP – Major Projects. Therefore, the Minister is the consent authority.

Draft State Environmental Planning Policy No. 66 – Integrated of Land Use and Transport.
The applicant failed to provide the ten principles provided in the draft SEPP with the original proposal.

The applicant has advised that draft SEPPs are not specific matters for consideration under Part 3A. However this draft SEPP is applicable to employment and population generating developments. The proposed development would generate a minimal number of jobs.

Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 26 – City West
Council previously stated that the proposed use appears to satisfy the objectives of the zone with the exception of providing rail access to port related activities. The applicant has responded by stating that the rail line is to be relocated by Sydney Ports Corporation to ensure continued use of the rail line into White Bay.

Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005
The site is located within the Foreshores and Waterways Area identified by this REP. The site is located within the Maritime Waters Zone as identified on the Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 – Zoning Map. The proposed project is consistent with these zone objectives.

Clause 26 of the REP requires developments to minimise any adverse impacts on views and vistas to and from public places, landmarks and heritage items. Concerns relating to visual impact have been discussed previously in this report.

Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan
Council previously raised the following issues:

No rail haulage is proposed with the development
Applicant's response – The proposal complies.

The height of the storage silo
Applicant's response – The height controls specified in the Master Plan specifically exclude silos.

Location of the proposed silo and warehouse
Applicant's response - The dome silo and warehouse have been deleted from the proposal.

Non compliance with the site area requirements
Applicant's response – The proposal complies.

Lack of details of landscaping, materials and finishes.
Applicant's response – The applicant has failed to address this issue.

Lack of details of proposed signage
Applicant's response – No signage is proposed on the silo.

Socio-economic impacts on the locality and the broader region is considered
The original proposal made provision for 10 employees at any given time for the facility. This has been reduced to 6 employees at any given time with the revised facility.

The economic / employment benefit that the facility provides for the local area is considered to be minimal.

Effective consultation with the public and Government bodies listed below
The original Environmental Assessment provides the following list of government bodies which have been consulted prior to the submission of the application.

- Department of Environment and Conservation.
- NSW Maritime.
- Leichhardt Council.
- Sydney Ports Corporation.
- State Rail Authority.
- Rail Infrastructure Corporation.
- Department of Transport.
- NSW Heritage Office.
- Roads and Traffic Authority.

The revised proposal states that during the exhibition period submissions were received from:

- Sydney Regional Advisory Committee (on behalf of the RTA)
- Sydney Ports Corporation.
- Leichhardt Council.
- Sydney Water.
- Department of Environment and Conservation.
- Heritage Council.
- Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority.
- NSW Maritime.
- Balmain Public School.
- Department of Education and Training.
- NSW Primary Industries.
- Sydney South West Area Health Service.

Community Consultation

Under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 the proposal was publicly exhibited for at least 30 days. The exhibition period was extended for 14 days at the request of Council and other interested parties. The community consultation process included:

- Distribution of newsletters to surrounding Balmain community. A newsletter was distributed to 450 near neighbours and key community stakeholder groups on 11 November.
- Maintenance of an 1800 free call number for community feedback.
- Conducting a community stakeholders meeting.
- Providing details of the proposed development on ICL's website.

During the exhibition period, Council received hundreds of copies of submissions from interested parties and local residents. Copies of these submissions were forwarded to the Department of Planning, along with Council's formal submission, before the conclusion of the exhibition period.

The revised proposal indicates that 1413 submissions were received by the Department of Planning from members of the general public and non-government organizations. Also, 12 submissions were received from government agencies.

The Department of Planning only forwarded 26 of the submission from the general public and non-government organizations and all 12 of the submissions received from the government agencies to the applicant for review.

In the revised proposal, the applicant has provided a response to the issues raised in the public submissions. The following is a list of the issues raised. A copy of the applicant's response is included in Appendix B of this report.

- Method and scope of community consultation
- Timing
- Need for the project
- Site Selection
- Request for further information on SPC tender process
- Project compatibility with changing nature of area
- Project component selection
- Construction phase: construction hours
- Construction phase: potential structural damage to neighbouring residences
- Trucks
- Siwertell unloader and closed screw conveyor
- Legislative Framework: SREP 36 – Clause 24
- Designation as a 'major project' under Part 3A of EP&A
- Recommended adoption of the precautionary principle in relation to the EP&A Act
- Sydney Harbour Foreshores and Waterways Area DCP
- Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan
- Height controls and definition of a 'silo' in the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan

- Legislative inconsistencies between Sydney Ports Corporation Strategic Plan and the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan.
- Call for a Master Plan to be developed for entire Sydney Ports Corporation Area.
- Draft Master Plan – Martin Bright Steel (MBS) Site: EA does not assess impacts on this.
- Community perceptions of the former EPA
- Proximity of project to residential areas Employment generation/impact on economic development
- Impact on local amenity. Poor use of prime foreshore land, setting precedent for “dirty”, “heavy” industry in the area.
- EA does not provide comparative socio-economic data from other OCL operations or other cement terminals
- Water Quality
- Water Management
- Air Emissions
- General concern about cement dust and health impacts
- Criticism of dust particulate criteria used in EA
- Cumulative air emissions
- Cumulative dust deposition
- Criticism of modelling used for measuring air quality in EA
- Claim of non compliance with Approved Methods for the modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW
- Criticisms of mitigation strategies outlined in EA
- Comparison made with air emissions made by the former coal-loader
- Heritage Capra building next to Wharf 3 has not been included as a ‘sensitive receiver’ in EA.
- General reference to undesirable noise levels
- Projected noise levels contravene NSW Government’s Sydney Metropolitan Strategy
- Reference in submissions to proposed operations reaching projected noise levels of 93 or 96dB at residences.
- Unattended ambient noise data listed in EA incomplete.
- Topography of area and impact on noise levels.
- Criticism of located of sites for noise measurement and modelling
- Criticism of noise mitigation measures outlined in EA
- Criticisms of noise mitigation measures outlined in EA and lack of comparative data
- Criticisms of noise modelling used in EA – cumulative noise measurements do not include noise from all sources
- Criticisms of application of DEC noise criteria in EA
- Criticisms of noise modelling and mitigation measures outlined in EA
- Cumulative noise levels
- Construction noise impacts
- Noise Management Plan
- General Reference to sleep disturbance
- Comparison of noise levels with former P&O operations
- Truck noise

- Heritage Capra building next to Wharf 3 has not been included as a 'sensitive received' in EA.
- General concern over impact on the heritage significance of the White Bay Power Station.
- Adverse impact on heritage significance of What Bay Power Station – non compliance with SREP 26.
- Adverse impact on heritage significance of White Bay Power Station – non compliance with White Bay Power Station Conservation Management Plan
- Request for complete heritage impact assessment
- Criticisms of the Landscape and Visual Assessment outlined in EA
- General Reference to height of dome silo, obstruction of views and potential shadowing of neighbouring properties
- Contravenes Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority's DCP 2005
- General concern about increased traffic associated with the proposal
- Rail option
- Alternative road haulage option
- Traffic volume data used in EA
- Request for an Environmental Risk Analysis
- Request for a Cumulative Impact Assessment
- Poor practice of existing port tenants
- Waste management
- Department of Air Environment and Conservation

The following is a list of issues raised by Government Departments. The applicant's response to these issues is included in Appendix C of this report.

Department of Environment and Conservation
- All potential air sources to be included in the assessment.
- Prediction of air quality impacts to be provided.
- Mitigation measures to be outlined.

Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority
- Heritage Interactions (supportive)
- Use, scale and form of new structures (supportive)
- Views to/from White Bay Power Station (supportive)
- Impact on heritage items on the site
- Air quality, noise and traffic

NSW Maritime Authority
- Traffic interactions

NSW Department of Primary Industries
- No objection to the proposal subject to conditions.

NSW Department of Education and Training
- Air Quality

NSW Health, Sydney South West Area Health Service
- Construction process
- Traffic assessment

Energy Australia
- Consideration of interconnecting cables.

Heritage Council of NSW
- Potential obstruction of views of White Bay Power Station

Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee (RTA)
- Cumulative traffic impacts on right hand turn bay James Craig Road.
- Vehicle entry and exit and manoeuvrability on site.
- Site works at no cost to the RTA

Sydney Water
- Section 73 Compliance Certificate.
- Serving capacity
- Stormwater / Heritage interactions
- Trade Waste
- Contamination

Sydney Ports Corporation
- Proposal consistent with current and future maritime usage of the site.

The following is a summary of the issues raised by Leichhardt Council in its submission to the original proposal. The applicant's response to these issues is included in Appendix C of this report.
- Air Interactions
- Noise interactions
- Truck Noise
- Visual Impact
- Lighting of the Facility
- Transport and Traffic Interactions
- Heritage Interactions
- Construction Hours
- Construction Methods
- Non compliance with Planning Legislation
- Non compliance with the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan
- Use of the out-of-date data in the Environmental Assessment
- Site selection
- Soil analysis and geotechnical analysis
- Environmental Assessment does not assess impact of proposal on Martin Bright Steel
- Waste Management
- Environmental Assessment does not include environmental risk analysis
- Use of Siwertell in adverse weather conditions
- Community Consultation
- Additional concerns raised in community submissions sent to Council.

7. DRAFT SUBMISSION

Council is to make a formal submission to the Department of Planning objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. Air Quality Management Plan

Council in the assessment of the original proposal recommended that the applicant be required to prepare an air quality management plan in accordance with the Environmental Assessment. The air quality management plan is to be prepared with a view to achieving compliance with the emission standards prescribed by the NSW DEC Impact Assessment Criteria including the *Approved Methods and Guidance for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales 2005* and the Protection of the Environment Operations (Clean Air) Regulation 2002. The air quality management plan is to be prepared prior to commencement of works on the site.

The applicant responded to this recommendation by stating that an Environmental Management Plan is likely to be established for the construction period which will incorporate air quality monitoring and performance reporting. This does not address Council's concerns in relation to the operation characteristics and air quality management of the development.

The applicant has also provided a modified project air quality assessment with the revised proposal. The following is an extract from the recommendations of this report:

ICL will develop an air quality management plan as part of the operational environmental management plan. The plan should include the following:

- *Stack emissions monitoring*
- *Complaints handling*
- *Minimal emissions management practices*
- *General operational particulate mitigation measures including a silo management system, displaced air being vented to suitable arrestment plant, ceasing silo filling is emissions of particulate matter are visible from ducting, incorporating interlocks into the plant control system for dust collectors, storing dusty waste in closed containers, undertaking regular maintenance of on site fabric filter dust collectors, undertaking regular sweeping vacuuming of operation areas.*

The applicant's response is inconsistent with the recommendations of the modified project air quality assessment. The applicant has suggested that air quality will be monitored during the construction phase only whereas the report recommends continual monitoring and adoption of processes to manage air quality for the development.

2. Noise

Council previously engaged Atkins Acoustics as an independent acoustic consultant to provide advice on noise issues associated with the proposal and the potential noise impacts arising at nearby developments. Given the Department of Planning's timeframe to comment on the revised proposal Council was unable to seek the services of Atkins Acoustics.

With the original proposal, Council raised concerns in relation to the level of information and detail provided in the noise assessment including sleep disturbance effects, demonstration of compliance with the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan, failure to address the requirements of the Department of Environment and Conservation Industrial Noise Policy and identification of the extent of the catchment area that would be exposed to the noise impacts.

In response the applicant has provided a modified project acoustic assessment. This assessment concludes that the original Environmental Assessment Noise Assessment provides recommendations most of which still apply for both construction and operational noise. It also concludes that the proposal complies with the NSW Government's Industrial Noise Policy and the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan.

As mentioned previously, insufficient time has been given to assess the modified project acoustic assessment thoroughly and therefore it is unknown whether the concerns of Council have been satisfactorily addressed.

3. Traffic and Transport

Council requested that the Zebra Crossing at James Craig Road and The Crescent be upgraded to a signalised pedestrian crossing, incorporated with the signalised intersection. The applicant has stated that this is request is not within the scope of works for the proposal. However, Council is concerned that the increase in traffic movements as a result of this proposal through the subject intersection will compromise pedestrian safety and therefore the upgrading of the crossing is justified.

In addition, Council has not received any clarification from the Department of Planning as to whether SEPP 11 applies to the proposal and whether due consideration has been given.

4. Visual Impact

The maximum height of the development has been increased from the 30m proposed with the dome to 55m propose with the silo. The footprint (or diameter) has been reduced from 48m proposed with the dome to 30m proposed with the silo.

As a result the height of the proposal is more dominating. Council is seriously concerned over the visual impact of the silo when viewed from Robert Street, Batty Street and Batty Street Park as it dominates the skyline. More importantly, the relocation of the silo has had the effect of providing for a dominant, adverse and overwhelming visual impact for people travelling west on the City West Link, Victoria Road and Johnston Street. This impact is considered to be significant and unacceptable.

5. Water Cycle Management

The Director General requires the consideration of a water cycle management, including water consumption and recycling. It is Council's opinion that the applicant has not addressed this requirement with the original proposal. The applicant has not responded to this concern with the revised proposal.

6. Soil Management

The original proposal recommended that a soil analysis and geotechnical anaylsis should be undertaken during the detailed design stage of the project. Council was of the opinion that these studies should be undertaken as part of the original Environmental Assessment given that the outcomes of these studies could influence the design, location and suitability of the development.

The applicant has responded by stating that a soil analysis and geotechnical analysis would serve any value during the planning process. These issues will be addressed prior to construction for operational purposes and in addition ICL has historical data on previous geotechnical assessments in the area.

This response is considered to be inadequate given that it fails to suitable regard to the matters of consideration for the development. Also, the applicant has failed to report on the historical data on previous geotechnical assessments in the area that ICL are suppose to have.

7. Waste Management

The applicant stated with the original proposal that the cement terminal has been designed as a closed system where no waste will be produced or will remain on site. Council considered this to be unrealistic to expect that the operation of the facility will not general any waste at all.

The applicant has responded by stating that solid waste during operation will include putrescible, domestic and inert debris which will be recycled where possible or disposed of at a licensed landfill site.

This response does not satisfy the requirement of a waste management plan and does not address the principles of "reduce, reuse, recycle" as requested by the Director General.

8. Environmental Risk Analysis

Council previously requested the provision of an environmental risk analysis that identifies potential environmental impacts associated with the project (construction and operation), proposed mitigation measures and potentially significant residual environmental impacts after the application of proposed mitigation measures.

The applicant has stated that this was done with the original proposal. However, the applicant is referring to a SEPP 33 assessment and whether the proposal is considered to be a hazardous or offensive industry.

Council is not disputing the SEPP 33 assessment. Instead Council is seeking the provision of an environmental risk analysis that prepares mitigation measures for potential environmental impacts resulting from the development.

9. Heritage

The applicant has responded to Council's concerns by stating that the proposal has a lesser visual impact and lesser impact on the White Bay Power Station. The applicant stated that during the exhibition period the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority are of the opinion that the proposal does not impact on the White Bay Power Station and therefore the application should be approved. The applicant has also indicated that no consideration has been given to the colours or materials of the proposal at this stage.

Council advises that the comments from other government departments (referred to by the applicant) were based on the original scheme and not the revised proposal currently being considered. In providing their response to Council's concerns that applicant has failed to undertake an adequate heritage assessment of the revised proposal and as a consequence the impacts of the proposal on the White Bay Power Station are not known.

Also, the applicant has not given due consideration to the materials and colours to be used in the proposed structures. The use of materials and colours is important factor in determining the impact that the proposal may have on the surrounding heritage items.

The applicant has failed to provide a revised heritage assessment to accompany the revised proposal. Reliance on the heritage assessment recommendations of the original proposal is not possible given the significant design changes. Therefore, it is considered that a revised heritage assessment that accurately reports on the revised proposal be prepared and given due consideration before determination of the application.

10. Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan

Council previously raised concern over the non compliance of the proposal with the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan. The applicant has responded to this by stating that the proposal complies and that no signage is proposed for the site. The applicant has also failed to provide any details on the landscaping of the site and the materials / colours to be used in the construction.

It is difficult to believe that there would be no signage provided on the site. The provision of signage on the site could add to the visual impact of the development particular given the sites location. Therefore, details of the proposal signage should be provided prior to determination of the application.

It is a requirement of the Glebe Island and White Bay Master Plan to provide details relating to landscaping and materials /colours to be used in the construction. The applicant has failed to provide these details.

11. Socio-economic impacts

The original proposal made provision for 10 employees at any given time for the facility. This has been reduced to 6 employees at any given time with the revised facility. Therefore the economic / employment benefit that the facility provides for the local area is considered to be minimal.

12. Community Consultation

At least 1413 submissions were received by the Department of Planning from members of the general public and non-government organizations during the exhibition period. Also, 12 submissions were received from government agencies.

The Department of Planning only forwarded 26 of the submission from the general public and non-government organizations and all 12 of the submissions received from the government agencies to the applicant for review. This means that only 2% of the submissions from the general public were referred to the applicant for comment.

Consideration of only 2% of submissions does not accurately represent the public and community response to this development.

13. Construction Activities

The flexible hours of construction proposed are unacceptable. In particular, the application proposes work to be carried out from 7am to 6pm Monday to Friday, 8am to 1pm Saturdays or 7am to 1pm on Saturdays if inaudible at nearby residential properties. No construction is to occur on Sundays or public holidays unless approved by the Department of Environment and Conservation.

Also for a 12 week period during the construction of the silo there will be a requirement for 24 hour continuous operation of the concrete pour.

Due to the proximity of the site to residential areas the hours of construction are to be specific and are to be regulated. This will provide certainty about the construction activities and noise for the local residents.

14. Consideration of Additional Sites

Council previously stated that additional sites have become available since the initial site options analysis was undertaken including the car storage yard and that consideration should be given to alternative sites for the proposed development. The applicant responded to this by stating that the use of the car storage yard would not be economically feasible given that it will not become available until 2008. Notwithstanding this, consideration should be given other alternate sites in addition to the car storage yard.

LEICHHARDT MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

REPORT

DIVISION:	ENVIRONMENTAL AND COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT
SUBJECT:	WHITE BAY COMMUNITY PLANNING
AUTHOR:	LETA WEBB, DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENTAL & COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT
FILE REF:	F06/00185
DATE:	4 SEPTEMBER 2006
WORD PROCESSING REF:	F:\Director\Leta\Councilreportwhitebayplan.doc

DIRECTOR'S SUMMARY - ORGANISATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications:	Nil
Policy Implications:	Nil
Strategic Plan Objective:	Nil
Staffing Implications:	Nil
Notifications:	Nil
Other Implications:	Nil

1. Purpose of Report

To inform councillors of the outcomes of a community planning workshop for White Bay and surrounds.

2. Recommendations

1. That Council receive and note the report.

2. That Council seeks support from the Minister for Planning, the Department of Planning and relevant state agencies for the development of a comprehensive strategic plan for the area including White Bay, Rozelle Bay and Blackwattle Bay, Glebe Island and the Rozelle Marshalling yards. Such a plan should consider the area as a whole, its proximity to Sydney and its opportunities for employment development, residential development, maritime activities and improved transport as well as its relationship with existing residential areas.

3. That Council calls on the State Government to not approve any development applications for the area which would have the potential to restrict future options for the area as whole until a strategic plan is prepared.

3. Background

On the weekend of 19-20 August, 2006, members of the community surrounding White Bay participated in a workshop to prepare a community strategic plan for the precinct including White Bay, Rozelle Bay, Blackwattle Bay, Rozelle Marshalling Yards. The workshop developed options for the development of the area, including maritime, landuse and transport options.

These options depended on consideration of the area as a whole. The area is currently administered by a number of government authorities. This is an impediment to comprehensive planning and a strategic vision for the area. Further part of the area currently has restricted access due to customs requirements. However, when all stevedoring uses move to Botany Bay or elsewhere it is unlikely that the need to have such restrictions will continue.

The workshop thus took a strategic view of the area as a whole and in context, identifying transport, landuse, maritime, heritage and employment constraints and opportunities and the relationship of the area to the Central Business District and adjoining residential precincts.

At the Council meeting of 22 August, 2006 the Mayor presented a minute which recommended that Council convene a meeting with State agencies to allow representatives from the community workshop to present outcomes from the workshop. This meeting took place on 31 August, 2006 and was attended by representatives from the RTA, Sydney Buses, State and Regional Development and Department of Environment and Conservation as well as representatives from Council, the community and Sydney City Council.

At the Council meeting of 22 August, 2006 Council also considered matters to be put forward to the Local Government Association 2006 Conference. This included the following:

WORKING HARBOUR/WHITE BAY	That Conference reports that it supports the retention of working harbour and freight options within Sydney Harbour. Conference calls on the NSW Government to develop a plan for the White/Rozelle & Blackwattle Bays which considers the area as a whole and is not constrained by the government agencies which currently control the land. This plan be developed in consultation with local councils and communities. No decisions be made which will restrict future options to improve transport until such a plan is developed. The existing rail freight corridor and potential for road links to improve traffic flows should not be compromised. Any plan or decisions made should not compromise the heritage of White Bay Power Station, the only one of its kind remaining in NSW, nor jeopardise its redevelopment and potential to provide employment opportunities.

4. Report

A summary of the key outcomes of the community planning workshop as presented to a community follow up meeting on 28 August 2006 is attached. The summary does not include all options considered by participants, but rather provides a summary of key principles. It also contains an example of a possible transport strategy and concept for development of a key transport and landuse / employmenet hub around the White Bay Power Station site.

The workshop had identified a number of more diverse options. These are captured in the “common principles” as summarised in the attachment.

However the key message of the workshop is that if a strategic view is taken of the area, there are a number of options for its future development.

The concern of the workshop was that there not be any proposals approved for the area which would have the impact of closing off options until such time that a more strategic plan for the development of the area in the longer term is prepared.

Because of the extensive size of the total area, its proximity to the CBD of Sydney and global Sydney, the fact that is one of the few areas left in the harbour with remaining deep water frontage, its potential to link with transport opportunities and its proximity to existing residential precinct, the area requires careful planning. The significance of the area is greater than merely of local significance.

5. Summary/Conclusions

The outcomes of the community strategic planning exercise have demonstrated that there is a need for a more strategic view and plan for the area around White Bay.

A strategic plan for the area that includes White Bay, Rozelle Bay, Blackwattle Bay, Glebe Island and the Rozelle Marshalling Yards will require involvement of various State government agencies as well as neighbouring Councils.

The meeting convened by Council with government agencies on 31 August, 2006 was attended by four government agencies and Sydney City Council. In itself, this is not sufficient to change government's approach to management and planning of the area. The community on its own is not likely to attract the attention and priority of State Government on the need to plan for the area.

As there is no agency that has responsibility for the whole area, the need for a strategic plan for the area is matter should be raised by Council with the Minister for Planning and the Department of Planning so that this potentially significant area can be considered and planned within its overall metropolitan context.

Please find attached Community Strategic Planning Worksop.