Dear Commissioners;

The opportunity to respond to the "Additional Material" policy of the IPC regarding SSD8544 is appreciated.

My response is framed by 2 words I never imagined in the context of my family home: **Fear & Anxiety**. The consequences of the Hanson approval have real impact on our lives.

Strategic Context:

Refence to the DPIE communication of 28 May in response to IPC enquiry dated 7 May.

a). (IPC) Implications on Bays West vision.

As with the original DPIE approval document, generic expressions abound.

Alarm bells ring at the use of imprecise and unmanageable phrases by DPIE such as

"would not preclude...other innovation solutions"

"subject to further detailed planning...careful consideration"

"relevant stakeholder"

"evolve over time"

b). (IPC) Coexistence of the proposal with potential future uses.

More generic DPIE statements of best endeavours but no commitment.

"new emerging technologies will play an important role". (I dare say this is true of every manufacturing industry.)

"further detailed planning would need to take place"

"greatest extent possible"

"appropriately mitigated"

"best achievable"

"strict noise criteria"

The original DPIE assessment predicts a 2-decibel noise exceedance in Jacksons Landing from the operations of the concrete plant alone. Certain Pyrmont apartments were constructed with noise attenuation features.

It is very doubtful that the original design elements for attenuation were conceived to respond to a 24-hour concrete batching plant, the MUF and simultaneous shipping movements.

This past week beginning 31 May illustrates my concerns about the consequences of the Hanson approval. For 4 nights, the vessel AAL Shanghai was berthed at Glebe Island in relation to the Multiplex Fish Market project. For 24 hours a day the machinery noise, attendant vibrations and light spill have penetrated our lives unavoidably.

Complaints lodged with the PA NSW call centre were met with the standard polite email explanation and no result.

The oil slick which coincided with the vessel at berth perfectly illustrated the environmental pollution consequences we can also anticipate.

The Hanson maritime expectation is 240 round trips each year. The single vessel encapsulated what the ill-conceived Hanson plant, (in combination with the MUF) is about to unleash.

The above DPIE statements are nothing but panaceas – there is no compulsion, no penalty for breaches, no responsibility other than the commercial imperative of Hanson.

In my opinion, the Department of Planning Industry & Environment process appears to have constructed a series of tame options for Hanson, which has largely set its own terms of engagement. DPIE's approval seeks to impose on the surrounding community a licence for Hanson to run to its own agenda, free of restraint.

As Mr Jamie Parker stated in his appearance before the IPC on 17 May: "If it's not a condition of consent, it does not exist".

In evaluating this proposal, I ask you to put yourselves in the shoes of the residents.

The proposal as it exists cannot proceed and I request the Commission to refuse the application.

Yours sincerely

Martin McAvenna



4 June 2021