

Minutes
Meeting #1
Port Botany Neighbourhood Liaison Group
11 August 2008

Attendees	
<p>Community members Charles Abela (CA)– Community Representative John Burgess (JB) - Community Representative Nancy Hillier (NH) – Community Representative Lynda Newnam (LN) – Community Representative Thomas Nolan (TN) – Community Representative Paul Pickering (PP)- Community Representative Tony Steiner (TS)– Community Representative</p> <p>Council representatives Karen Armstrong (KA)– Randwick City Council Paul Shepherd (PS) – City of Botany Bay Council Fay Steward (FS)– Rockdale City Council</p>	<p>Business representatives Brad Crockett (BC)– Terminals Pty Ltd Mick Egan (ME)– Patrick Stevedores James Mather (JM)– DP World Stevedores Aldo Costabile (AC)– Elgas Limited</p> <p>Sydney Ports representatives Shane Hobday (SH) Sarah Hartson (SHa) Kamini Parashar (KP) Grant Gilfillan (GG) - welcome Paul Weedon (PW)</p> <p>Apologies Jenny Branighan – Origin Energy Michael Daley – NSW Local Member Stuart Tierney – Customs</p>

Agenda Items
<p>1. Welcome – CEO Sydney Ports Corporation, Grant Gilfillan</p> <p>GG gave a welcome speech and thanked everyone for giving their time. SPC is keen to work with the community, councils and port businesses to attempt to address issues of concern, Sometimes not all parties will agree on the way forward on a particular issue but he hoped there would be a robust debate, a respect for each others views and a concerted effort to resolve issues. GG also mentioned that he was always very happy to talk to any member of the group and they were welcome to approach him at any time.</p>
<p>2. Introductions</p> <p>Sydney Ports representatives PW – Chief Operating Officer SH – General Manager Environment, Community and Security (Chair) SHa – Operations Manager, Property KP – Senior Manager Corporate Affairs (Convenor)</p> <p>Community members LN – Handed out a sheet explaining her interest in joining the group (attached)</p> <p>NH – Interested in all facets of the port and does not like the port expansion. Hopes what is planned for the expansion for community and environment is successful, says workload as a community member is enormous and the number of different areas impacted by the port is huge.</p> <p>JB – Australian National Sportfishing Association National CEO and Vice President of the NSW Branch, and is also involved in a number of committees in the local area.</p>

TS – A resident of Maroubra

TN – A resident of Maroubra and interested in recreational uses of the bay.

CA – Resident of La Perouse and interested in traffic and transport and is Chair of La Perouse Precinct Committee.

PP – Resident of Dent Street and interested in boating and biking.

Business representatives

JM – Representatives of **DP World** which has expansion plans under way to reduce movements of containers by truck with extension of the rail line. Expecting to start work mid next year.

AC – represents **Elgas** largest LPG storage facility in Australia storing 65,000 tonnes underground. They send 65% of their products out of the port by trucks and the balance by smaller ships to other east coast ports. Very conscious of safety and it has been almost 7 years since their last Lost Time Injury. They run their business in an open and transparent way and want to listen and communicate with the group.

BC – represents **Terminals** which has 2 facilities in Vic, 1 in SA, 1 in Botany and 4 in NZ. They have 65 tanks at Port Botany storing a wide variety of chemicals and refined products as well as manage QENOS hydrocarbons facility. They were the first bulk liquids tenants of the port and want to hear from the community and neighbours.

ME – represents **Patrick** who have just completed commissioning 3 new Rail Mounted Gantries as a part of a multi-million dollar investment. They listen to their employees and want to do the same with their community partners. They are keen to hear what the community wants and expects from them.

Council representatives

PS – Keen for Committee to be successful as there were a number of developments happening in and around the port which the community should have input and information on. He is also on the expansion committee and feels that is focusing on the expansion and this group should focus on broad port activities

FS - representing Rockdale City Council which is interested in traffic and transport and how port affects them and minimising amenity impacts on the nearby residents.

KA – representing Randwick City Council which is also interested in traffic and transport issues.

3. Discussion on Terms of Reference of Group

JB thought the terms of reference were too narrow and that the group needed to take a “whole of port” approach in a bid to address the infrastructure challenges that lay ahead. Government Agencies with responsibilities for different aspects of the port’s operation together with stakeholders in the port/customer supply chain (eg State/ Comm Rail, NSW RTA, Freight forwarders, Transport operators and the TWU) should have been considered for inclusion in the group.

NH said that if the construction of the port did not achieve all its environment and community commitments where could the community go to complain? She asked if anyone from Rail was invited and what were they going to do about noise attenuation during and after construction. What was being done about

locomotives which were 50 years old? Does SPC have authority to upgrade rail to what it should be?

PW responded that SPC did not.

NH said that raiiling of containers was a large problem for the port.

CA asked if businesses represented at the table were willing to give out their email addresses so people could contact them if they had questions.

Business representatives around the table were happy to have their email addresses given to the group – however not for distribution outside members of the group.

Action: SPC to circulate contact list of all attendees.

LN mentioned that the Ministry of Transport should be invited and that there was some difference of opinion amongst different government agencies at the IPART hearings. JB agreed with this.

LN asked as Transport is a big issue could we focus on transport for the next meeting.

KP mentioned that there were a number of different parts of the government agencies who would need to attend the meetings and as such specific agencies could be invited if there were particular questions that the group wanted to ask.

Action: SPC to list as agenda item and invite agencies as appropriate. SPC to add this to Terms of Reference.

PW informed the group that ARTC was taking over from Railcorp and they would probably be interested in briefing the group on what they had planned.

Action: SPC to approach ARTC and ask them to brief the group in the near future (at the next meeting if possible) on the duplication of the rail line.

PS said that the Terms of Reference were fairly open ended and as we were here to discuss problems and issues associated with the port, each business represented here needed to address what they proposed to do.

Terms of Reference to be reviewed every year and membership to be reviewed every two years.

Agenda items

The group agreed that a standing agenda item should be upcoming developments.

Timing and venue

Group agreed that the timing and venue should be the same as today, with a meeting to be held every 3 months. Randwick Council requested that meetings should not be held 2nd and 4th Tuesday as these were Council meeting days.

NH requested that any papers for discussion at the meetings should be circulated prior to the meeting so members would have a chance to read them.

KP mentioned that agenda would be sent out two weeks prior to the meeting with members coming back with suggested agenda items.

Minutes to be circulated as draft within a week, as far as possible, with comments due back in a week.

Group to be chaired by SPC.

Specific agenda items

Bicycle lanes

Paul Pickering talked to a letter he had written to Botany Council about bicycle trails in and around the port (attached). Discussion followed with PP mentioning that an RTA representative be asked to come to the meeting to discuss this issue. LN suggested that PP write to the RTA.

KA mentioned that Randwick Council had prepared a draft bike plan which had been exhibited for public comment and would be reported back to Council in September. Can be viewed at the link http://www.randwick.nsw.gov.au/Your_Council/Previous_consultations/Randwick_City_Bicycle_Plan/index.aspx

Action: KA to inform members when reported back to Council.

LN mentioned that a number of workers used a bicycle to access the DP World facilities.

CA mentioned that in the past there was a proposal to make a 3 parks facility in the area connected with bicycle lanes.

The group agreed that this was a matter for the Councils and the RTA to resolve and the Ports Corporation voiced the opinion that bicycle and trucks were not compatible.

PP asked what the works were being done on Botany Road. SHa mentioned that these were possibly works being done by Vopak for a pipeline and that a DA had been approved for these with SPC giving landowners consent. SHa also mentioned that landscaping was proposed when the works were complete.

Action: SPC to provide members details of what this work is asap.

SPC Response – the works mentioned were part of SPC's maintenance works to protect the high pressure pipeline. The fencing mentioned by the group was temporary in nature and was to be removed once the works are complete. The area impacted is totally within SPC's boundary.

Boat ramp facility management

Tony Steiner presented a list of questions (attached) on the future management of the boat ramp and surrounding areas.

SPC circulated a management plan for the Public Realm and mentioned that this contained the principles on which the boat ramp and surrounding areas would be managed. The details would be worked out closer to the opening of the area to the public which was expected in early 2011.

KP mentioned that 50 extra parking lots (30 at Millstream Lookout and 20 in the tug berth area) for car parking had been added and that boat/trailer parking would be managed through signage at special events. Security would be assessed and measures taken to lock down boat ramp or other actions as

required to keep anti social elements out of the new areas. Landscaping was also planned to maximise surveillance.

JB inquired when the tug berth development would be proceeding and if it was to be delayed would public access to the designated open area be allowed in the interim.

PP was concerned that if the boat ramp was to be locked at night provision should be made for a design which allowed people to leave the ramp and not enter it – engineering barriers.

JB expressed dissatisfaction with the new boat ramp design as it stood, with respect to protection from waves. KP mentioned that this issue had been raised by boating/fishing groups and was being addressed in other forums. KP would report back to this group the outcome of these discussions.

Action: KP to provide details of what wave heights would be prevalent at the boat ramp and what it had been designed to. If possible, the modelling would be provided. Copies to be provided to JB, LN, PP, TS.

Action: KP to provide details of outcome of decision on wave heights at ramp, when made.

Shipping channels

TS was concerned about the channels available after the berths were complete.

KP explained that a 150m recreational channel would be provided once the construction was complete, between the runway and the new berths.

JB indicated there was concern with possibility of the Commonwealth and Airport Corporation wanting to increase distance of no go zone adjacent to 3rd runway. Such an outcome would impact on port shipping activities and create an access problem for rec boat users

4. Other Matters

JB again emphasised the need for a whole of port approach and stakeholder involvement in dealing with critical infrastructure issues such as adequate rail linkages, adequate truck/ trailer parking and driver amenities, adequate access roads to service the port, parking of trailers along Foreshore Rd and in residential areas and the queuing of trucks on the main access roads to the port. JB asked that these issues be given a priority by the group as it was the public perception that no one accepted responsibility for dealing with these issues at a macro or micro level and that leadership from the Government and the principal stakeholders involved with the port was absent and lacking in consensus for direction and resolution. It was integral for the success of the port, the interests of the various stakeholders (including the general public and local residents) and the NSW economy at large that clearer direction, responsibility and leadership be championed.

PW said that a number of initiatives were being progressed by the port behind the scenes to address these issues and that SPC was happy to share some of these.

Next meeting

18 November 2008, 5.00 pm.

Port Botany Neighbourhood Liaison Group

Meeting - 11 August 2008

Lynda Newnam – Community Member

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Website: www.laperouse.info - byline “*Social Change NOT Climate Change*”

Newsletter: *Environmentally Speaking*

KEY ISSUES

- Beyond the Sydney-centric view: the Port is a major public asset in what the CSIRO has recently described as the most threatened area of Sydney. Planning for a sustainable future for Australia where coordination of the Nation's Freight Task is a critical part of the bigger picture.
- Valuing the neighbourhood – the biodiversity of Botany Bay, The People, The unique History of national significance –understanding the diversity of local needs and the needs of visitors, working together as neighbours, and forging truly meaningful partnerships.
- Botany Bay has replaced Sydney Harbour as the main port in NSW – recognizing the shift and shifting the sponsorship, partnerships and the CARING and the PRIDE to Botany Bay.
- When asked to describe in a few words my understanding of the local environmental/community or business needs of the area neighbouring the port of Botany I listed – *Health, Safety, Certainty, Honesty, Transparency.*

Community Members: Charles Abela, John Burgess, Nancy Hillier, Lynda Newnam, Thomas Nolan, Tony Steiner, Michael Daley

Business: Doug Eng/Brad Crockett (Terminals P/L), Mick Egan (Patrick), Paul Burtenshaw (DPWorld), Stuart Tierney (Customs), Aldo Costabile (Elgas), Jenny Branighan (Origin)

Councils: Karen Armstrong (Randwick), Paul Shepherd (Botany Bay), Fay Steward (Rockdale)

Ports: Shane Hobday, Sarah Hartson, Kamini Parashar, Grant Gilfillan, Paul Weedon

Paul J Pickering
~~2-Burrows~~
~~BURROWS POINT NSW 2010~~

29/6/07

The Mayor,
City of Randwick,
30 Francis St.,
Randwick. NSW 2031

Dear Sir,:

Local residents believe that there is a good case to be considered by Sydney Ports, as a good Corporate Citizen, for a shared pedestrian/bicycle path between Foreshore Road, Botany and Prince of Wales Drive at Bumborah Point.

I was requested to make representation from local residents to the Community Consultative Committee on the Port Expansion in Botany Bay: That a shared bicycle/ pedestrian path be paved on the nature strip between Foreshore Beach/Sir Joseph Banks Park east around the perimeter of Port Botany to Bumborah Point/Bi-centennial Park (Prince of Wales Drive at Yarra Bay). This is virtually non existent and difficult to traverse along Botany Road. The only section paved is on the railway bridge opposite the corner of Beauchamp and Botany Roads and the recently built pedestrian path along Bumborah Point Road. Locals believe that it would be safer if there was good separation between trucks servicing the port and pedestrians/bike riders. The current situation is dangerous and intimidating for cyclists sharing the roads with large trucks.

There is considerable evidence of bogged bicycle marks in the soft sandy surface of the proposed path. Obviously, Port associated workers have tried to get to work safely by bicycle and have had difficulty in the soft sandy surface. Bumborah Point Road now has pedestrian pavement courtesy of Randwick City pedestrian pathing policy.

Sydney Ports representatives were adamant in their response to my submission in that they do not want any pedestrians or bicycles on this route at all, regardless of whether they are Port workers or locals. Further they added that it is their land and they would resist public access to this most direct route between Yarra Bay Beach and Foreshore Road Beach. Safety was their concern as larger trucking systems are going to be introduced.

I responded on safety grounds, that there were only six depot entrances crossing the proposed pedestrian/bike route and that each had a security gatehouse that impeded truck movements. Small "GIVEWAY" signs on the pedestrian/bike trail at each gateway would be sufficient to insure safe separation from trucks no matter how big they may be. If the shared path was installed on the other side of Bumborah Rd, fewer entrances would be crossed.

I hope that this gives you some idea of our current concerns. Would you please consider these concerns and perhaps make representations on our behalf to achieve a sensible safe outcome. I understand that this issue would involve two Local

Government areas as the path crosses the border. Insert from another local resident's email: **There has been a precedence set with shared bicycle/pedestrian facilities within the Botany Municipality. The area around the airport and Qantas towers has been upgraded to provide shared facilities. The ratio of heavy and light vehicles in this area is very similar to the port area.**

I have been approached by residents in both Botany and Randwick sides of the border to make representations on this issue, which I have. I think I have come up against a brick wall.

Funding: My inquires with the RTA revealed that this project may attract a fifty percent subsidy from RTA and if Sydney Ports acknowledging their duty of care and as good Corporate Citizens and with support from their local clients, stevedores, freight forwarders etc the balance maybe covered at minimum cost to local Government.

The Port and its associated activities has been an intrusion that local residents have had forced on them and it is time that we all work together to make this area a better, safer place to live and earn a living.

Yours faithfully,

Paul J Pickering
CCC Resident Representative to Sydney Ports Expansion
Email to: 

~~Kamini Paraske~~

From: Property Rescue [mailto:~~property.rescue@spc.com.au~~]
Sent: Wednesday, 23 July 2008 1:56 PM
To: ~~property.rescue@spc.com.au~~
Subject: Agenda topics

Hi Kamini,

Thanks for the reply and clarification of the committees role.

I will limit my contribution to ongoing Port operations only. In light of the fact that the new boat ramp will be complete in about 2009, I feel it is important to bring the following agenda items to the table.

Please note that these items are the "ongoing port operations" that will impact recreation anglers, boaters and local residents alike, and that these issues have been expressed by local residents.

1. Boat Ramp Facility Management.

We need to discuss the management plan for the boat ramp facility, since this will be under ongoing port operation and control so we can determine what measures are needed to resolve the following issues

- How will SPC manage the potential conflict between boat owners and visitors with regards to parking
- How will SPC manage the potential risk of male and female prostitution occurring at the new facility
- How will SPC manage the potential for trucks entering the carpark
- How will SPC manage the potential risk of gay men performing sexual acts in and around the facility
- How will SPC manage the potential risk of drug takers using the facility
- How will SPC manage the potential risk to boat owners in prevailing weather conditions
- How will SPC manage the potential failing of the breakwall to protect boat owners in prevailing weather conditions

Some of these items are occurring with the existing facilities and it is felt that the new facilities will only increase these activities.

It is my opinion that SPC should not be building a facility that will attract vermin and undesirables and the management plan should address trying to avoid these problems for the future under its "ongoing port operations".

2. Shipping Channels

We need to discuss how the ships will berth at the new facility, as currently recreational boaters are allowed to use the shipping channel. What restrictions will we see under "ongoing port operations" once the port is expanded.

The above items have been noted from the many discussions I have had with local residents and recreational anglers in the area.

Many thanks and looking forward to the first meeting

Tony