

Source Document:

**REVIEW OF AIR QUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENTS GLEBE ISLAND
PORT CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT & GLEBE ISLAND MULTI-USER FACILITY
GLEBE ISLAND NSW**

PREPARED FOR: EDO NSW on behalf of Jacksons Landing Coalition

DATE: 30 August 2018

The Review of Air Quality Impact Assessments was commissioned on behalf of Jacksons Landing Coalition.

The report purpose is to consider the Air Quality Impact Assessments of the 2 proposed developments on Glebe Island Precinct:

1. Concrete Batching Plant (Hanson)
2. Multi-User Facility (Port Authority).

The report evidences limited process by the MUF proponents and a failure by both Hanson & the Port Authority to consider the cumulative effect of both industrial plants operating simultaneously 24/7.

The commissioned review itemises inadequate site planning, failure to consider the cumulative environmental effect of both projects, and refutes the traffic consequences of these proposed developments.

Backed by scientific research, legislative knowledge and peer-reviewed, the key concerns of the 38-page report are abbreviated below, with emphasis added:

P 25, MUF Input Data Collection:

"...did not comply with this stage of the assessment since it did not collect any information relevant to the quantitative assessment."

P 27, Para 3.1.5 MUF Impact Assessment Report

"The AQIA report for this proposal is inadequate and certainly does not comply with the EPA's requirements."

P 27, MUF Specific Comments:

"The report did not provide justification for not undertaking such a quantitative assessment in accordance with current NSW government..."

P 29, Item 4

"...it appears that the proposals main boundaries (of CBP & MUF) are likely to overlap by several metres.

It is also clearly evident that the access road which will be used for the Multi-User Facility will be located within the Concrete Batching Plant boundaries."

P 31, para 1:

"...the AQIA prepared for the Multi-User Facility is inadequate and it does not meet the fundamental and basic requirements included in the EPA's approved methods."

P 31, para 4:

"...the AQIA for the Multi-User Facility did not include quantitative air emission assessment... "

P 31 para 6:

"...meteorological data is inconsistent between the two proposals which does not give confidence to the stakeholders including the community. This is an extremely important factor for the prediction model especially under prevailing weather conditions."

P 32, para 2: On why a REF was preferred to an EIS

"...for the assessment of potential impact on human health and environment due to air emissions alone an EIS should have been prepared.

When considering the traffic impact, noise and cumulative impacts from all the proposed activities, I believe that an EIS should have been prepared."

P32, para 3:

"...The air emissions, noise and vibration generated by the proposed activities will certainly have the potential to interfere with marine life and may cause significant damage to the heritage listed items located in the vicinity of the proposals."

P 32, para 4:

"None of the AQIA recommended any air monitoring program at any location which is very unusual for such highly dense urban areas..."

P 32 para 5 On traffic

"I do not agree that the concrete batching plant proposal will remove 65,000 truck trips per year from NSW regional roads network to be a justification for the proposal, because the proposal will create 502,970 truck movements per year on Sydney's local roads based on 689 trucks per day or 1,378 truck movements per day for 365 days per year."

The full report can be viewed here:

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/edaf32_c5ff1ded9bee454b85389620a9834e88.pdf