

**Port Botany Expansion  
Community Consultative Committee**

**Date:** 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2008

**Meeting number:** 19

**Attendees:**

John Burgess (JB) - Community Representative  
 Nancy Hillier (NH) – Community Representative  
 Neil Melvin (NM)- Community Representative  
 Paul Pickering (PP)- Community Representative  
 Bronwyn Englaro (BE)– Randwick City Council  
 Paul Shepherd (PS) – City of Botany Bay Council  
 Roberta Ryan (RR) – Chairperson  
 Sandra Spate – Minutetaker  
 Shane Hobday (SH) – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Peter O’Leary (PO) – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Marika Calfas (MC) – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Jessica Berry (JBe) – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Margaret Harvie (MH) – Baulderstone Hornibrook  
 Linda Coburn (LC) – Baulderstone Hornibrook  
 Vince Newtown (VN) – Baulderstone Hornibrook  
 Paul Jerogin – Bovis Lend Lease  
 Angus Northey (AN) – Baulderstone Hornibrook  
 Bram Van Renterghem (BVR) – Jan De Nul

**Apologies:** Neil Brener (Community Representative), Karen Allan (SPC), Quentin Pitts (BHJDN)

**Not present:**

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
1	<b>Minutes of last meeting</b>			
1.1	Karen Allan was omitted from the attendance list of the last meeting’s minutes.			
1.2	<p><u>Actions arising from previous minutes</u></p> <p>Item 1.2, PS advised the meeting that council had met with BH-JDN several times regarding approvals for works on Foreshore Rd and issues have been resolved. Matter closed.</p> <p>LC reported that regarding Item 3.2, additional signs had been erected which would hopefully clarify Foreshore Road pedestrian access points to Foreshore Beach.</p>			

	<p>AN reported that Beachwatch was now accessing Foreshore Beach by boat. PP asked how long before vessels such as canoes could access the water from the beach. LC replied it would be when construction activities are complete.</p> <p>Discussion on items 3.10 regarding public displays and 4.2 regarding median nutrient levels will be raised later in the agenda.</p> <p>Regarding item 5.1 SH reported that clean up of the observation area at Molineaux Pt had been undertaken and more would be done.</p> <p>Item 5.2 regarding a Section 96 modification. This is still in process and will be presented to the CCC when ready.</p> <p>Item 6 regarding security for the new boat ramp is an ongoing issue. SH will continue to liaise with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>On Item 7.1 regarding a new community representative for the committee, RR reported that discussions were taking place with a prospective member and hopefully this would be resolved shortly.</p>			
<b>2</b>	<b>New Community representative for the committee</b>			
	This was discussed in the previous agenda item.			
<b>3</b>	<b>Update on construction and activities</b>			
3.1	<p><u>Presentation by BH-JDN (VN)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>December and January – undertaking weed removal and landscaping at Foreshore Rd</li> <li>Stage 2 of the temporary</li> </ul>			

	<p>navigation channel diversion is being implemented this week</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dredging is continuing in the reclamation area.</li> <li>• At the Millstream lookout area, piles of rock is being assembled for the boat ramp retaining walls, with placement commencing January</li> <li>• Foreshore Rd works continue. the new acceleration lane is being built before Christmas and the deceleration lane in January.</li> <li>• Pavements at the boat ramp in January. Deliveries of rock for the boat ramp in January.</li> <li>• The amenities building has commenced, piling works are currently being undertaken.</li> </ul>			
	Questions and discussion			
3.2	<p>NM asked whether the current 70kph speed limit for Foreshore Rd would remain.</p> <p>VN responded that it will stay at 70kph during construction</p> <p>PS reported that the speed limit after construction is still up for discussion.</p> <p>SH noted it was ultimately an RTA decision but NSW Police are recommending it remain at 70kph.</p>			
3.3	<p>NH asked whether SPC is making a video of activities for historical records.</p> <p>SH responded that they were, as well as a written history.</p> <p>NH suggested taking pictures of the old CCC meeting room.</p>			
3.4	<p>PP asked whether drainage pipes in the middle of Foreshore Beach would be built over, to make it like a jetty type structure.</p> <p>MC responded that the pipes currently on the beach would remain as they are, and the three stopping at the back of the beach may have a headwall constructed. She noted that they are currently sitting at the back of the beach and if a jetty structure was to be built over them, they would be more</p>			

	<p>prominent. SH noted that there was no constant flow from these pipes and that water would only flow from these in extreme storm events. PP asked whether spills in Hale St would exit from these pipes. PS and JB asserted that no spillage from the industrial complex is released here, only flows from Sir Joseph Banks Park.</p>			
<b>4</b>	<b>Overview of Water Quality Monitoring during dredging</b>			
4.1	<p><u>Presentation by Bram Van Renterghem from Jan De Nul</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are six continuous measuring points, two in the seagrass area, two outside the silt curtain and two in the bay.</li> <li>• They measure mainly turbidity but also temperature every 15 minutes.</li> <li>• The measurements and warnings are fully automated</li> <li>• If turbidity or temperature reach warning levels action is taken to reduce turbidity</li> <li>• If EPA limits are exceeded, work stops till the problem is rectified.</li> <li>• The system operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.</li> <li>• In addition weekly samples are taken and included in monthly reports including nutrient levels, heavy metals and contaminants.</li> </ul>			
<b>5</b>	<b>Update on communication activities including complains</b>			
5.1	<p><u>Presentation by BH-JDN (LC)</u> An updated Q and A sheet regarding changes to the navigation channel for recreational boat users reflecting Stage 2 was distributed. The Stakeholder Statistics Report from November 4 to December 9 was distributed. Construct update summary was distributed.</p>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No complaints have been received since last meeting.</li> <li>• Two notifications were being issued. One to residences in streets near the Port about upcoming services works in January and the commencement of footings for the new pedestrian bridge linking the park to Foreshore Beach.</li> <li>• The second regarding the Glebe Island temporary site compound (i.e Berth 2 at Glebe Island) for assembling oversized structures to be shipped to Port Botany in early January.</li> <li>• The newsletter intended to be distributed in December has now been held over until mid January to avoid being lost amongst Christmas and new year junk mail. It will advertise the mid week and weekend public displays scheduled for the end of January and early February respectively.</li> </ul>			
	Questions and discussion			
5.2	<p>MH asked whether the group thought timing for displays would be preferable in or out of school holidays. The CCC didn't have a preference for this.</p> <p>BE asked at what time of day the displays would take place. LC replied that both displays would be 10am until 2pm</p>			
5.3	PP noted that contractors are using barges to transport materials.			
5.4	<p>PS asked for details of the construction worker behaviour event and the traffic safety event. LC reported that the traffic safety event in the report related to a resident who indicated insufficient 70km signage on Foreshore Rd. Locations of signs were related to the resident who then checked and agreed these were in</p>	BH (LC) to supply details of the construction worker behaviour event to members who have	BH-JDN	

	<p>place.  JB reported a major traffic gridlock two weeks ago.  LC replied that as this wasn't construction related, comments regarding this were passed on.  MH noted that as statistics reflect multiple select, more than one issue may be recorded per event.</p>	requested it.		
<b>6</b>	<b>Environmental monitoring Monthly Report – BH-JDN Government Pier Heritage Remains</b>			
6.1	<p><i>Presentation by BH-JDN (AN)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elevated dust levels which occurred in October but were within DECC guidelines haven't occurred over the past month.</li> <li>• No work has occurred around heritage government pier following location of possible further heritage remains and the redesigned lookout has been moved further away from the pier. This has been documented to the Heritage Office.</li> <li>• No whales have been sighted but a seal has been in the vicinity. Training from ORRCA has been undertaken on whale identification.</li> <li>• No noise from the construction site has been above limits.</li> <li>• There have been no odours</li> <li>• Weekly monitoring of the saltmarsh area has indicated some slight changes since the removal of mangroves.</li> <li>• Saltmarsh transplanting has been successful.</li> <li>• There has been some increase in the total seagrass area.</li> <li>• Sedimentation monitoring has indicated some increased sedimentation in Penrhyn Estuary.</li> <li>• Two more bird species have arrived. However, the pied oyster catcher chicks didn't survive.</li> <li>• No waste management issues</li> </ul>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water quality – elevated nutrient levels have been recorded.</li> <li>• No acid sulphate soils have been found.</li> <li>• Implementation of target bird deterrents in the reclamation area seem to have been successful.</li> </ul>			
	Questions and discussion			
6.2	<p>JB suggested that changes in the Saltmarsh area would continue as there had not been capping of drains. He suggested there was no point undertaking major environmental works if this would be washed away with any major discharge.</p> <p>PJ responded that drain capping was not a part of the project.</p> <p>SH and BE noted that slowing the flow could create flooding upstream.</p>			
6.3	<p>JB noted that monitoring done by BHJDN indicated general noise in the area exceeds the projects noise limits for day and night. These are not specifically port related but related to traffic and the airport. He asked how Botany Council would respond to this. NH noted that Council doesn't look at the cumulative affect when approving DAs, but each DA separately meets guidelines. Collectively they exceed these and this is a problem particularly at night.</p> <p>PS noted that ambient levels have increased. Council had wanted to measure background noise levels as a baseline, but couldn't get funding.</p>	CCC members to refer the issue of general area noise to the Port Botany Neighbourhood Liaison Committee	CCC members	
6.4	<p>PS asked how the nutrient median was arrived at, noting that he would like to be able to see the results for the area prior to construction works and compared to what it is now.</p> <p>AN replied that the median was calculated from monitoring during construction.</p> <p>PS confirmed he would like to see the median of pre-construction monitoring.</p> <p>MC asked if PS would like wet or dry</p>	BHJDN to use median using monitoring prior to construction. Both wet and dry conditions to be reported	BH-JDN	

	<p>weather monitoring. PS confirmed if both are available that would be good.</p>			
6.5	<p>PS noted the council had received a call from the EPA hotline regarding a pipe discharging dirty fluid onto the beach. This was the dredged sand being discharged onto the reclamation area.</p>			
6.6	<p>PS asked whether the sedimentation plates are in the right place, in light of a separate photo that shows a large amount of sedimentation in an unknown location MC responded that the deposition plates are in the intertidal area as too much sedimentation here would kill benthos in the bird feeding area and the image in question was from within the saltmarsh zone which the sediment plates are not directly related to. JB suggested that figures for the deposits on the sedimentation plates extrapolated over a year would exceed limits MC responded that this measurement is a cumulative measurement. RR noted that it isn't labeled as cumulative in the report.</p>	<p>BH to improve labeling of photos, with location and clearer information.  BH to state in monthly monitoring reports that the sediment measurement is cumulative.</p>	BH-JDN	
6.7	<p>PS asked whether the bird roosting island is still in the estuary as it wasn't apparent when he looked. JBe noted that it doesn't appear as island from all locations. It is still there. At low tide it is not an island.</p>			
<b>7</b>	<b>Banksia St Overpass</b>			
7.1	<p>Presentation by MC - SPC is currently working on a design concept for the overpass. The reason for the overpass is to allow for closure of the at-grade rail crossing and eliminate the need for trains to sound a warning signal on approach. The overpass would allow people to cross the rail line and provide disabled access. Constraints of the proposed overpass at Banksia St are: that it requires disabled access; a large number of services are located here; and the</p>			

	<p>minimum height to allow for trains would be 5.5m.</p> <p>Double ramps of 60m each in length totaling 120m each side of the overpass would be required to achieve the disabled access code. This would mean the structure would have a height of 9m (the height of a 3 storey building).</p> <p>It has been suggested by Botany Council that this large structure may not be well received by residents. An alternative suggestion by a representative of Council was to create an access across Stephen Rd instead. This change would require consultation with the community, and as a first step, the opinion of the CCC is sought.</p>			
	Questions and discussion			
7.2	<p>NH emphatically opposed the proposed alternative location at Stephen Rd, as it means residents have only one way out. If an evacuation of the area was required in case of an accident in the industrial area, people wouldn't be able to get out as there would no longer be access across the rail line at Banksia St. The relocation would also affect people disembarking and embarking at the bus stop prior to William St who access the Pagewood residential area. PS suggested that current pedestrian counts here are 90 per day and are likely walking to the pool and shops. He suggested one rationale for the location of the access at Stephen St was the new LEP that included a new community facility in this area, but this may be years away.</p> <p>NM suggested that the ramp on the concept design aimed towards the south is in the wrong direction.</p> <p>PS suggested another ramp down to the north as a compromise.</p> <p>JB expressed the opinion that the proposed overpass at Banksia St is a horrendous structure. He suggested raising the rail track and building a pedestrian underpass.</p> <p>PS noted difficulties with security,</p>			

	<p>safety and graffiti with an underpass. BE asked whether a lift could be built on either end.</p> <p>MC noted difficulties with security and maintenance for lifts and safety with an underpass.</p> <p>NH asked whether an escalator was feasible.</p> <p>SH noted maintenance and security (emergency stop) difficulties with escalators out in the weather.</p> <p>MC noted a 400m difference between the two locations. Should we explore options at Stephens Rd?</p> <p>PS noted that a destination survey at Banksia St would be required.</p> <p>NH reiterated her opposition to the Stephen Rd location. She said the perspective of the LEMC should be considered as well as new residents moving into the area.</p> <p>PP noted the current overpass at Stephen Rd is intimidating for cyclists due to the narrow lane.</p> <p>PS replied the intention would be to widen this to 3.5m.</p> <p>The CCC agreed to investigate both options.</p>	<p>SPC to conduct a destination survey at Banksia St.</p> <p>SPC representative to the Botany LEMC to raise the issue of moving access from Banksia St to Stephen Rd at the next LEMC meeting and report back to CCC.</p> <p>SPC to develop concept for pedestrian ramp integrated with existing Stephens Road bridge</p>	<p>SPC</p> <p>SPC</p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Other matters</b>			
8.1	<p>MC reported that Condition B2.19 limits construction activities to specific hours and only allows construction outside those hours by approval of the EPA through the Environment Protection Licence. However, some construction activities that need to occur outside those hours are not licenced. The EPA can't give approval for activities that aren't licensed so SPC is seeking to amend the condition to approval by DoP for works that are not licensed and works that are inaudible to residents outside of set hours.</p> <p>PP asked what activities would be</p>			

	<p>covered by this. MC replied that it would cover activities such as the overnight delivery of reinforcement steel for tying, nighttime roadworks and Foreshore Rd service crossings. PS stated that council would object. They would need to ensure that the Construction Noise Management Plan which was signed off by the CCC is adhered to. NH noted that when railway work was done at night each house was notified of the timing and duration. If residents know a finite time they are more likely to agree. LC reported that BH always notifies for a worst case scenario.</p>			
8.2	<p>PP asked whether the tug berths would be constructed as rock wall and whether this could be used by the public for fishing. SH replied it will be a rock wall. The contract has it being fenced at this time. Discussions about future use are ongoing.</p>			
8.3	<p>PS noted a plan on the wall indicating the dredging area. Is it possible to provide dredging plans of to the CCC?</p>	BH to supply periodic progress plan of dredging, reclamation	BH-JDN	
<b>9</b>	<b>Christmas Close Down</b>			
	<p>SH thanked community members, Council representatives, chair and minute taker for the efforts over the last year and conveyed seasons greetings to the group.</p>			
	<p><b>Next Meeting/s- agenda items Tuesday Feb 3<sup>rd</sup></b></p>			

These minutes have been endorsed by the Chair, Roberta Ryan.

