

**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**Meeting #9**  
**Glebe Island White Bay Community Liaison Group**  
**Leichhardt Town Hall**  
**Marion St, Leichhardt**  
**5.30pm-7.00pm**  
**Monday 18 August 2008**

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Community Representatives</b>	Ann Bastock John Fisk Mary Mortimer George Cooper Damian Cobley-Finch
<b>Lessees</b>	Paul Weaver – Gypsum Resources Australia Thomas Carroll – Lubrizol
<b>Agencies</b>	Rachel Josey – Leichhardt Council
<b>Sydney Ports Corporation</b>	Kamini Parashar (Chair) Shane Hobday Alistair Palmer Christa Sams
<b>Minutetaker</b>	Sandra Spate
<b>Apologies</b>	Carolyn Allen, Elizabeth Elenius, Peter Conroy.

**MEETING RECORD**

**1. Introduction and apologies**

Apologies were received from Carolyn Allen, Elizabeth Elenius, and Peter Conroy. Shayne Wilde and David Martin were not in attendance.

Kamini introduced Sandra Spate to the meeting as minute taker, in response to a request from the CLG for more detailed minutes.

Shane Hobday, General Manager, Environment, Community and Security for Sydney Ports was introduced to the meeting.

Mary asked if there is yet a nominee from City of Sydney Council.

Kamini reported that Sydney Council indicated they would nominate someone prior to the next meeting.

**2. Minutes of the last meeting**

George asked for clarification regarding item #3 on plans for the location of the passenger terminal.

Alistair responded that the two options for this were Barangaroo or White Bay. This will be addressed later in the agenda.

Ann noted an article in the Sydney Morning Herald reporting the architects of the original design are horrified at current plans for Barangaroo. She also expressed disappointment that ferry passengers would no longer have access to this area.

Alistair responded that as the area at Barangaroo is in the ownership of SHFA, SPC has no say in this.

George noted that Balmain residents were concerned at the possibility of the location of the passenger terminal at White Bay.

### **3. Letter to OCG and feedback from CLG members**

Kamini reported that a letter from the Sydney Ports Community Liaison Group to OCG was sent on July 28, but that to date no reply has been received.

**Action:** The meeting agreed that if no reply was received after 6 weeks from July 28, Kamini should draft a follow up letter to be circulated to members prior to sending to OCG.

George distributed copies of a question asked in Parliament by Sylvia Hale (attached to minutes) regarding the stage of development of a new masterplan for White Bay; whether the Baileys Marine Fuels Australia industrial and refueling proposal would be deferred until the masterplan is completed and adopted; and whether applications to develop White Bay would be considered in the context of the whole site rather than on a piecemeal basis. The reply to the questions indicated an interagency taskforce has been established to consider issues related to the Bays Precinct generally, including White Bay and Glebe Island. George noted in the reply to these questions, the Coordinator General has requested that any decision on the Baileys project be deferred pending further consideration and consultation on the future of the precinct. He asked whether SPC had any further information on this.

Kamini responded that SPC had no further information.

### **4. Report on activities from Lessees**

**GRA** - Paul reported that noise testing was continuing on ships as they come in and there was no incidence of excessive noise to report. A new ship would arrive in October 2008, a little bigger than the other ships currently coming into Glebe Island. It is a 32,000 tonne self unloading vessel fitting into the existing hopper for quicker discharge of cargo.

**Action:** Paul to email CLG members as to when in October the ship will arrive.

**Bulk Liquids – Lubrizol** - Thomas reported one ship visit to White Bay on July 3 - the next is due in early September.

### **5. Report on activities by Sydney Ports**

Alistair noted there was nothing further to report on Baileys other than what has been conveyed. For the cruise terminal there are two choices: Barangaroo and White Bay. Expressions of interest are out for Barangaroo and the process is in place looking to appoint preferred developers. This process will determine the location of the terminal. SHFA is running the process.

George asked for clarification in relation to the location of the terminal at White Bay berths 3 to 5. He indicated people wanted to know what size a future structure would be.

Alistair responded that the size of the existing terminal at 8 Darling Harbour would be an indication of the size of the passenger terminal. Clearance under the Harbour Bridge would be a limiting factor on the height of ships using this facility. A timetable of development at Barangaroo is available on the website [www.barangaroo.com](http://www.barangaroo.com)

**Action:** Kamini to send the Barangaroo website link to CLG members (included in these minutes).

Damian asked whether transport related to cruise ships would be looked at, noting the close proximity of the wharves to areas of Sydney city centre.

Shane responded that vessels berthing here would generally be vessels based in Sydney. These are generally catering for people living in or near Sydney going on 7-10 day cruises. There would be a requirement for enough space to be able to cater for passengers' vehicles and trucks which would supply provisions for passengers for a 10 day period.

Christa noted requirements for assessment of the proposed terminal would need to take into account all impacts of the new terminal, including traffic.

Mary asked whether SPC would be managing operations, supplying, customs etc.

Kamini noted that it would, and that an environmental assessment would be undertaken prior to the development going ahead.

Alistair reported the last car vessel would be at the end of October 2008 followed by a transition period into November for the removal of cars and building structures including cars stored at White Bay 5.

**Action:** Kamini will email CLG members the date of arrival of the last car vessel at Glebe Island.

George noted an article in the Sydney Morning Herald about a fire at White Bay Wharf 4 which reportedly took a while to put out.

Shane replied that SPC first received notification from someone aboard the container ship at the adjacent wharf at 8.30am on July 9. The Fire Brigade was contacted immediately and arrived on site at 8.36am. Sydney Ports has a fire fighting tug as well as another fast vessel with a fire pump based at Millers Point which was made ready and arrived on site at 8.55 am. The fast vessel was used by the Fire Brigade to extinguish the fire. By 9.20am the site was declared safe, less than 1 hour in total. The response time was 15-20 minutes. Crews at Millers Point train weekly with the Fire Brigade and there is a direct phone line from Sydney Ports' Harbour Control to fire control.

Damian expressed the opinion that this was excellent work. Mary emphasized the importance of coordination of emergency services in the response.

George reported that residents nearby had been concerned by the fire. Ann noted that residents could smell and see smoke from the fire.

## **6. Report on Community activities**

Kamini reported to the meeting that the Inner West Metro Strategy from the Department of Planning, which included the ports area, was now open for comment. Copies are available through council.

Rachel indicated nothing new to report from Leichhardt Council.

Damian drew attention to the council elections being held next month, noting there had been a considerable drop in the number of nominees standing. One group standing was in opposition to the Iron Cove Bridge Plan. He informed the meeting of his position as a Labour Councillor.

George asked how figures in table 4 in the Sydney Ports Sustainability Report regarding noise complaints were arrived at. He noted that this graph indicated the number of complaints for 2005-06 were higher than 2002.

Christa explained that as the number of ships coming into the Port was lower in recent years, the figures were based on complaints per hundred ships. The reason the number of complaints about White Bay is high is due to the close proximity to residents. There were a total of 34 complaints in 2006-07. It is anticipated that 2008 will be higher again.

Alistair indicated that it should be noted that this is an overestimation of complaints, as multiple complaints may relate to one vessel.

Mary reported that the area of great concern to Pyrmont residents was the area at Bank St under the Anzac bridge approaches. Residents have been trying to ensure the government honours its promises that the area would be used for passive boating. A letter from Pyrmont people raised concerns about the area being included in the area the Bays Precinct Taskforce will consider. Other information indicated SHFA had recently acquired the area. Mary reported that the Glebe rowing club used to hold regattas in Blackwattle Bay and have approached NSW Maritime to hold a regatta in Blackwattle Bay again this year but their request has been denied. There is anxiety from rowers and Dragon boaters about the continued opportunity for passive boating. She reported several incidents in which rowers ran into yachts moored with no lights or notices leading to rowers being charged.

Shane noted that SPC's primary concern with passive rowing would be if it interfered with commercial vessels. He indicated permission to moor is given by NSW Maritime.

Kamini suggested Mary raise this issue with Shayne Wilde of NSW Maritime.

Mary thanked SPC for the proposed use of its Fire Tug for the upcoming Christmas celebrations at Jacksons Landing.

Ann reported there had been some heavy noise early in the morning at the port, but this was not before dawn. She hopes that when the car terminal goes it is not replaced by more highrise.

Mary asked whether SPC had any further information on the future of Glebe Island.

Kamini replied that it is part of Bays Precinct Taskforce area. The taskforce have indicated they will consult with the community and have requested a list of CLG members as well as other community members from Sydney Ports.

## **7. Department of Environment and Climate Change licence for WB berth 4 and complaints report**

Christa distributed the complaints summary for White Bay 4 licence. No complaints have been received for the bulk liquids unloading since the last meeting.

A total of 17 other complaints about Glebe Island and White Bay had been received since the last meeting. Six of these were about one vessel *Stolt Stream*, four concerned the car terminal with ramp noise and exhaust fan noise. Two related to bulk vessels at Glebe Island, two related to trucks at White Bay and the remainder (3 complaints) were about more general noise issues.

## **8. Paper from White Bay Precinct Committee – held over from last meeting**

A statement to the SPC CLG from the White Bay Precinct Committee had been distributed to the previous meeting and held over for discussion (paper attached).

Concerns related to:

*Minutes of the Sydney Ports CLG meeting often omit detail which conflicts with Sydney Ports Corporation position on various issues.*

**Response:** Mary indicated that there had been a general lack of detail, but this was not specifically related to items opposed to by SPC. The meeting indicated this has now been addressed by the appointment of an independent minutes secretary. Added detail will assist members in reporting back to community.

*The minutes fail to record some statements that have been prepared for and presented to the meeting.*

**Response:** The CLG agrees that documents presented at the meetings will be attached to the minutes in future.

*There is a lack of focus or interest on a number of concerns which directly affect our residents and our local environment.*

**Response:** The meeting agreed that no major issue had been ignored. Mary indicated that one concern in her view was that when issues are raised, SPC representatives aren't always able to respond with authoritative views. It was not always clear where concerns went from the meeting and whether there was real input from the community into SPC decisions.

Christa responded that everything raised at meetings is taken back to SPC.

Kamini noted that a lot of issues raised here not determined by SPC, but are decisions made as whole of government. Minutes from this meeting are circulated on the SPC executive and all are aware of issues raised here. Shane Hobday will also be attending future meetings.

Shane reported that for over 10 years concerns of the community regarding White Bay have been raised at an executive level at Sydney Ports and the executive is aware of issues of concern in the community.

John suggested that there may sometimes be unrealistic expectations.

Kamini noted the Terms of Reference for this group were to take issues and information from the community and provide feedback to community. She is empowered to speak on behalf of SPC and to convey community concerns to the organisation.

*There is an inability to appreciate and/or impartially consider community concerns and complaints relating to White/Bay and Glebe Island*

**Response:** Alistair replied that as a port corporation SPC was concerned with support for port related business partners and return for investment, but this must be carried out with concern for the environment and community.

*A too strict and inflexible control over attendees participation in the meetings*

**Response:** Damian indicated this position was absolutely wrong, that there was no strictness regarding ability of members to fully participate in meetings.

Ann indicated that there had previously been issues in this regard, but these no longer existed.

Kamini thought the issue raised was of who can and who can't attend meetings. Open meetings are not held as it is difficult to exchange information and views in this context. Delegates have alternates as requested by members of the CLG.

*A requirement that representatives of the committee cannot approach the media. The precinct has received two complaints directly from people who are unhappy about this.*

**Response:** Kamini clarified that the terms of reference for the group are that no one person can approach the media as a representative of the CLG unless this is agreed to by the CLG. This is also to protect members of the group from having views attributed to them in the media which may not be theirs. Individuals can speak to media as individuals.

The meeting agreed that these terms of reference had been detailed at the first meeting and members were happy to participate on those terms.

*Given the vested interest of Sydney Ports in this local area, there seems to be an inability of the Sydney Ports committee to consider concerns impartially. As such, resident concerns about development proposals or future use of White Bay, in particular, are virtually ignored by the committee.*

**Response:** Mary indicated that in her experience, this is not the way in which the committee worked. Damian agreed that the above is an unfair view of the operation of the group. The CLG didn't feel it needed to respond to beyond this, as these issues have been dealt with in the past.

*Sydney Ports representatives are dismissive of community campaigns against current and past proposals along White Bay*

**Response:** as above.

*Sydney Ports representatives appear to dismiss widespread concerns with the current Glebe Island/White Bay Masterplan.*

**Response:** Kamini noted that as it was a Sydney Ports Masterplan, SPC does defend the plan.

It was noted that the group used to have an independent chair, but it was decided by the CLG that this was not needed. Damian expressed full confidence in Sydney Ports chairing the meetings.

Mary indicated that the Pyrmont community was not of one mind with regard to the White Bay precinct. Some in Pyrmont will be happy to see car terminal go, but there is strong community support for some continuation of a working harbour. Although there is concern over noise and pollution issues, it is still part of our environment, part of the reason people moved here. She stated she would be uncomfortable if the committee was under the impression of a general community opposition to a working harbour. If properly managed as in other areas of the world, it would be part of the core of the city.

Ann emphasised the need for constant vigilance around noise and pollution.

*Sydney Ports Corporation does not provide the community with advance notice that communicates the use of berths e.g. White Bay Wharf 2.*

**Response:** Kamini responded that this had been discussed at length at the previous meeting. It was felt that by the time a request comes in the ship/vessel/activity is already at the wharf, by the time information goes out, the vessel/activity has gone. For longer term use of the berth an email would go to out to members and for use by organisations such as Boulderstone Hornibrook (Bridgeworks Alliance) for Harbour Bridge repairs, they would be required to issue community communications. Advertisements in the paper would be of little use, as the local paper (Village Voice) comes out monthly.

**Action:** Kamini to clarify with Christina whether the precinct committee would like an SPC representative to attend precinct meetings to present around specific issues. If not, the minutes from these meetings are an update to the community. SPC is happy to make presentations around particular issues.

**Action:** SPC to prepare a draft response distilling the discussion around issues raised by the precinct committee and circulate it to members for endorsement prior to sending to the precinct committee.

**9. Next meeting date**  
**Monday 17 November 2008**

The next meeting will be Monday 17 November, 2008 5.30 pm at Leichhardt Town Hall, unless more information becomes available about the Baileys proposals, the cruise terminal, the Masterplan is released for consultation or a reply is received from OCG, in which case a meeting will be convened earlier as information becomes available.

ends

**Item 3** handout by George Cooper **2026—MASTER PLAN, WHITE BAY**

**Ms Hale to the Treasurer, Minister for Infrastructure, and Minister for the Hunter representing the Minister for Planning, Minister for Redfern Waterloo, Minister for the Arts—**

1. In late 2006 the Premier announced the Government's intention to develop a new masterplan for White Bay.
  - a. What stage has work on the new masterplan reached?
  - b. When is it expected to be completed?
    - i. If work has not commenced, why not?
  - c. If the taskforce is not working on a new masterplan, what is it currently working on?
2. Is Baileys Marine Fuels Australia industrial and refuelling proposal currently being assessed using a masterplan document that many residents regard as out-of-date and deficient?
3. Will consideration of Baileys Marine Fuels Australia application be deferred until the masterplan is completed and adopted?
  - a. If not, why not?
4. In view of the fact that all occupants of the waterfront industrial area at White Bay have now relocated, will consideration of any applications for development at White Bay be considered in the context of the whole White Bay site rather than on a piecemeal basis?
  - a. If not, why not?

**Answer—**

An interagency taskforce has been established to consider issues related to the Bays Precinct generally, including White Bay and Glebe Island.

The Coordinator General is currently developing a consultation process to ensure industry and community views are heard.

An independent panel has been established to investigate the proposed Bailey's refuelling facility at White Bay.

However, the Coordinator General has written to me requesting that any decision on the project be deferred pending further consideration and consultation on the future of the precinct.

---

Question asked on 26 June 2008 (session 54-1) and printed in Questions & Answers Paper No. 62.

Answer received on 29 July 2008 and to be printed in a Questions & Answers Paper on 23 September 2008.

**Item 8 Precinct statement** for

Sydney Ports Corporation - Community Liaison Group

We request that this item be addressed at the May meeting of the Sydney Ports Liaison Committee.

The meeting of the Balmain and White Bay Precincts held on Monday, 5 May 2008 discussed a number of ongoing concerns regarding the Sydney Ports Community Liaison Group.

The Precinct has sought feedback about the Sydney Ports Community Liaison Group after a number of concerns were raised over a year ago. This feedback expresses a general dissatisfaction with the committee.

After discussion of this item at our precinct meeting, there was a show of hands which unanimously supported the following:

“A statement of concern by residents of Balmain and White Bay should be conveyed to Leichhardt Municipal Council, Sydney Ports Corporation and the Sydney Ports Community Liaison Group.

These concerns relate to:

- Minutes of the Sydney Ports CLG meeting often omit detail which conflicts with Sydney Ports Corporation position on various issues.
- The Minutes fail to record some statements that have been prepared for and presented to the meeting.
- There is a lack of focus or interest on a number of concerns which directly affect our residents and our local environment.
- There is an inability to appreciate and/or impartially consider community concerns and complaints relating to White/Bay and Glebe Island.
- A too strict and inflexible control over attendees participation in the meetings.
- A requirement that representatives of the committee cannot approach the media. The precinct has received two complaints directly from people who are unhappy about this.
- Given the vested interest of Sydney Ports in this local area, there seems to be an inability of the Sydney Ports committee to consider concerns impartially. As such, resident concerns about development proposals or future use of White Bay, in particular, are virtually ignored by the committee.
- Sydney Ports representatives are dismissive of community campaigns against current and past proposals along White Bay.
- Sydney Ports representatives appear to dismiss widespread concerns with the current Glebe Island/White Bay Masterplan.
- Sydney Ports Corporation does not provide the community with advance notice that communicates the use of berths eg White Bay Wharf 2”.

Sydney Ports Corporation have a vested interest in this area and the objectives of the Sydney Ports Corporation often conflict with residents and our local environment. The previous Sydney Ports Corporation committee – the Community Noise Reference Committee – was another forum that residents have said was ineffectual in dealing with

noise concerns. There had been a number of complaints, of an ongoing nature, about this committee.

The Sydney Ports Corporation has not listened or responded appropriately to our community over many years.

At our next Precinct meeting, residents will take up this matter again and make recommendations that will aim to improve the Sydney Ports Community Liaison Group. One of these recommendations will be to remove the Sydney Ports Corporation from the role of chair of the committee. Another will be to ask for a monthly informative update report from Sydney Ports to the Precincts and the opportunity to hold an extraordinary meeting if a matter arises that needs urgent attention or discussion.

We request that the above statement of concerns be included in full with the details of this meeting on the Sydney Ports Website.

## Balmain and White Bay Precinct - Statement on current issues

The Balmain and White Bay Precinct Committee has asked its representatives to present this statement at your meeting today:

1. The Balmain and White Bay Precinct Committees do not support industrialization of the inner-city foreshores of our wonderful Sydney Harbour. We object strongly to the policy positions of the Sydney Ports Corporation which would see a return to industrial use of White Bay.
2. Over the past 20-30 years, the inner-city has dramatically changed. Government policy has primarily centred around urban consolidation. The huge developments around the inner-city harbour foreshores in recent years demonstrate this. These include Balmain, White Bay, Pyrmont, Glebe and soon, East Darling Harbour. The focus has been on creating medium to high density residential housing around the inner-city foreshores. The State Government Metropolitan Strategy suggests that tens of thousands more people will move to the inner-city in the next 15 or so years. Yet, there has been very little additional community amenity to support this unprecedented urban consolidation and population growth. This must be addressed.
3. Our community has expressed a united voice in calling upon Council and State Governments to initiate a new planning approach for our inner-city foreshores and environs which recognizes the enormous changes in the inner-city over recent years, the high levels of urban consolidation and places community priorities at its core. As such, the Government abandon the old plans (i.e. Glebe Island/White Bay Masterplan). We need planning guidelines that assist decision-makers to resolve problems for our local community NOT create them!
4. The Sydney Harbour Foreshores Authority has received over 800 submissions opposing the Baileys proposal for White Bay Wharf 6.
5. Panel Hearings (re: Baileys) - on Mon/Tues 4th & 5<sup>th</sup> February at Leichhardt Town Hall, an independent panel of experts - set up by the Minister for Planning - held hearings regarding the Baileys refueling and industrial proposal for White Bay Wharf. The panel consists of three experts: Former Deputy Premier and Minister for Planning, Dr Andrew Refshauge, Former CEO of NSW Maritime Authority, Matthew Taylor, Director, noise consultant Wilkinson Murray, John Wasserman. Of the 24 people attending the hearing, 21 spoke against the Baileys proposal. Residents made a strong and tight case against the Baileys proposal on environmental, health, safety and amenity grounds. Key arguments were underpinned by independent research and tests, followed by technical presentations on noise and traffic impacts which were presented to the panel. There was strong objection from a current fuel supplier on the harbour (Sydney Fuel and Barge) who said that the location was inappropriate and that there was no need for the Baileys facility. Furthermore, they said that the Baileys proposal would unnecessarily increase boat traffic in a heavily used area and could adversely affect employment in the industry.

6. Opposition to the Baileys proposal at White Bay Wharf 6 is widespread throughout our community. The strong community campaign against this proposal has seen Council, our State MP, the Birchgrove Precinct, Balmain & White Bay Precincts, Balmain Association, the White Bay Joint Steering Committee, strata boards adjacent to White Bay and thousands of residents believe in and support that White Bay Wharf 6 is an inappropriate location for the Baileys proposal. There has rarely been a campaign that has aligned so many groups in our municipality against a proposal.
7. Council, our State MP, the Birchgrove Precinct, Balmain & White Bay Precincts, Balmain Association, the White Bay Joint Steering Committee, strata boards adjacent to White Bay and thousands of residents support a process that would see a new plan for White Bay/Glebe Island to replace the current masterplan. The current masterplan is out-of-date and allows 24/7 operations and intensive industrial use of inner-city foreshores next to high density residential areas and on the doorstep of the CBD. These plans were drafted prior to our huge inner-city residential growth.
8. Sydney Ports Annual Report shows escalating noise complaint rates at White Bay which are 65 times higher than for Port Botany and 16 times higher than East Darling Harbour. Yet, Sydney Ports and SHFA carry on regardless, inviting IC&L, Baileys and other maritime/industrial proposals to White Bay that would exacerbate these problems.
9. White Bay is owned by the public of New South Wales. The need for industrial or commercial working harbour in this location is now over. Its economic benefit as a working port (in comparison to the other massive and expanding ports - Port Botany and Port Kembla) demonstrate that White Bay has little purpose as a working port. Any job creation which might result from industrialization or commercialisation of White Bay is misplaced. These jobs should be located where they are desperately needed, at the other ports to provide vital jobs for working families in these areas. The White Bay foreshores should be returned to the people of New South Wales.

We request that this entire statement be included on your website with the minutes.

