

To Dr Allan Hawke AO
Enquiry Federal Department of Defence
Garden Island proposal for cruise ship terminal

1 Preliminary

We refer to our preliminary submission of 13th September, 2011 - see below- in which we made comments about adverse impacts on residents and heritage in Potts Point, a residential area abutting any proposed Garden Island Terminal. Those comments are still relevant.

2 City of Sydney Council submission

Council purports to represent residents within its local government area jurisdiction, including Potts Point.

Council has indicated it is making a submission together with a Traffic Impact Study.

See council Lord Mayoral Minute of 22nd August, 2011, item 3.1.

Link:

http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/Council/documents/meetings/2011/Council/220811/110822_COUNCIL_ITEM31.pdf

Clover Moore's Lord Mayoral Minute claims such a terminal would "prevent traffic and transport impacts" and states "This review should involve the public."

Comments

We disagree that transport impacts are prevented and submit any new terminal cannot prevent adverse impacts: it must only lead to an increase in vehicular traffic and road loads because of increased numbers of people within the same area and will therefore exacerbate impacts.

We agree that the public should be intimately involved but council has not asked for any public comments. Its Minute was not produced after any evaluation or input from residents with no draft submission proposed, no letters or public advertisements seeking comments or any background paper put to any Planning Policy Committee. Council's Lord Mayoral Minute is simply one person seeking to impose their views on everyone else. It is not a democratic document and lacks any mandate. There was ample opportunity to present such a background paper before the lodgement finalisation time. This Minute should be disregarded. It does not represent our members' views, none of whom [apart from executive] were advised of its existence.

"I also support the sharing of deepwater berths between naval and commercial shipping, when appropriate, and if the impacts on the densely populated surrounding area can be managed to protect residential amenity" .

Comment

Clover Moore MP has previously said she *opposes* any more commercialisation of the harbour. She said unequivocally to residents on 12th May 2010 in Kings Cross: "I am absolutely opposed to ... the increased commercialisation ... of the harbour, causing amenity, heritage and environmental impacts."

source: <http://www.clovermoore.com/main/?id=3506>

This janus-faced political approach is not conducive to good policy: it is not clear what exactly Clover Moore as either MP or Lord Mayor really thinks or why. There is a conflict of interest between Clover Moore as Lord Mayor and Clover Moore MP: she can't represent the same constituents twice with different views.

Council's actual submission to this Review has not been ratified by all Councillors or the community.

We submit comments in her Minute should be be disregarded as ambiguous or disingenuous, but in any event, should carry little weight with the Review.

"a ferry terminal with connections to Circular Quay should provide passenger access to the City. This would reduce traffic congestion and provide a direct and more scenic entry to the City. Ferry services are currently provided to Garden Island".

Comment

This is a naive comment. About 30 newly-purchased ferries would be required. This would increase on-harbour traffic congestion, not reduce it. Such purchases should be borne by cruise ship operators, not taxpayers.

"This is a chance to consider future uses of the whole naval compound."

Comment

This comment is no more than a land grab. If new site uses were introduced their planning and consent approval would need to flow to the NSW government as the Federal Government has no guidelines in place for any site development or consent procedures. The Royal Australian Navy, on-site since HMS Sirius arrived in 1788, would need to be gone - hardly a practical and certainly a *highly expensive* option. The site would then be sold to the NSW government with the City of Sydney Council becoming the consent authority.

Within five years development applications for multi-high rise overlooking the Harbour, Blues Point-style, would be lodged and fought in the NSW Land and Environment Court. In the densest urban area in Australia, only residents would be the losers. Developers have told our group already they are already eyeing-off the site.

"The residential precincts of Potts Point, Elizabeth Bay and Kings Cross are the most densely populated areas in Australia and continue to grow, but there is very limited access to public open space.:

Comment

Allowing one cruise ship terminal would not create more open space: it would create a precedent for expansion for more, bigger terminal/s and reduce views to the heritage-listed harbour. Views and open space would be reduced and/or traduced.

Residents now enjoy direct access to open space within five minutes walk at:

- Embarkation Point Park, on top of the RAN carpark
- Fitzroy Gardens Park
- St Neot Avenue pocket park
- Rushcutters Bay Park
- Roslyn Street Plaza park
- Springfield Plaza park
- and the Domain - 10 minutes walk

"We support a long term master plan."

Comment

So do we - but not one that means *any* losses of amenity or heritage

"The occupation by the Navy and associated uses has kept our foreshores closed for too long"

Comment

Public access to Garden Island is already provided:

- on Royal Australian Navy open days
- when access to the heritage centre is requested or utilised
- when the public take the open access ferry services from Circular Quay. When members of our society have been there, we've found many hundreds of others there too.

Access is therefore not closed off as suggested nor are all the foreshores: it is restricted because it has to be: this site is a fully-functioning secure RAN Command Bravo Base and part of Australia's weapons defence system. It is not a tourist kiosk.

"Council's submission should also address potential impacts on local amenity, transport and traffic and other relevant issues"

Comment

Agreed. Council should provide the following documents in support of its submission:

- Social Impact Statement
- Heritage Impact Statement
- Traffic Impact Statement
- Acoustic Impact Statement
- RTA traffic report
- NSW Police Traffic Management report
- General Plan of Management or ingress and ingress for the site

Without these, its claims are mere conjecture and are biased.

We have requested council's submission to the Review but this has been refused to date. We have requested their Traffic Study but are advised by Carnival Australia there will be none until the Review has made a decision about location. We say the Review cannot make any meaningful conclusion about the location of any new terminal without a comprehensive - *independent* - traffic study.

Without such a study, and other studies, the Review can be in no position to determine that traffic impacts from any new terminal will be benign. It should not therefore support any new terminal at Garden Island.

Council's views, really Clover Moore's view, cannot be seriously considered, we submit, for the above reasons and we ask they be discounted as they:

- not views we have had any opportunity to comment upon
- contradictory
- irrelevant
- conjecture
- undemocratic
- lacking statistical back-up by relevant studies

3 The Review - public notification

There has been insufficient public notification of this Review in our submission. The Review: It is not listed on council's website.

It is not given any prominence on Clover Moore's MP newsletter.

There have been no letters to residents.

There have been no public meetings of any kind where residents can speak, either at council, or anywhere else.

There have been three small ads in three local papers for one week to the best of our knowledge: in the *Wentworth Courier*, the ad was on page 92 at the very rear of the paper adjacent to ads for "Escort Services".

In our view, this Review cannot be said to have taken into account the public interest sufficiently: it has taken into account vested financial interests and political interests and our views.

But with population of about 25,000 in the Potts Point area alone and with many others visiting the area, only a small percentage of those affected have any cognisance of this Review or its Terms of Reference or its ramifications on their right to live in their current chosen environment.

4 Scope of works

This Review is considering a proposal for a cruise ship terminal at Garden Island, Potts Point in the most general terms. There is no actual proposal for:

- any design
- a plan of management
- plans of terminal buildings, eg location, size, bulk, capacity
- any precise location at Garden Island
- hours of operation
- restrictions on the number, type or size of vessels
- provision for passenger or crew access

The review should not make any final recommendations until these particulars are provided and the public given an opportunity to comment upon them. Otherwise, any future proposal may unduly rely on this Review's general recommendations in support of a specific proposal that was unforeseen by the Review.

This would not be in the public interest.

5 Carnival Australia submission

I was invited to a meeting last month, which I attended, with Carnival CEO, Ms Ann Sherry. With permission, I took notes of that meeting, which revealed that Carnival:

- Is looking to berth vessels at one of three sites on Garden Island at this stage
- **Option A** is on the north east corner, **Option B** is on north western side and **Option C** is on the South western side [near Harry's Cafe de Wheels]
- The RAN prefers Option C but prefers the terminal not be on Garden Island
- About 50 berthings per annum are hoped for at Garden Island by 2020- this figure is not capped
- There will be more intense usage during different parts of the year
- The Cruise Ship terminal would be as high as the 7-8 storey car park nearby facing Cowper Wharf Roadway and include a large car park
- Garden Island is preferred in order to offer passengers a harbour panorama as they arrive
- Vessels, such as RMS QM II stay two days
- Most vessels stay one day, arriving 6-7am and departing 5pm the same day
- Passengers would disembark onto about 200 buses for departure by road with some vessels containing over 6,000 passengers - but excluding crew
- Vessels would re-load at about 1-2 pm
- The heritage-listed Hammerhead crane and its removal was mentioned as an option, reasons not stated
- Vessels take on about 20% - 30 % of new passengers
- Work on any terminal is hoped to be completed by 2015

Comments

1. All options would create enormous traffic movement problems in Australia's densest urban area.
2. Without any cap on berthings or ship sizes, loss of views, noise, impacts etc will be exacerbated - up to 5-6 ships may dock, but at least one per day during high season.

3. Any proposed terminal at Option C site would result in loss of views for those in its southern and eastern side, ie thousands of property owners. It should be noted that any development consent is not subject to City of Sydney Council control nor NSW State Government control: the site is owned by the Federal Government and design, height, bulk, impacts etc., can be approved by the Minister himself. Public input is not required. For residents facing the eastern side, ie Elizabeth Bay, Options A will reduce views to the Harbour, lowering property values.
4. For residents facing the western side, Options B & C will reduce views to the Harbour, lowering property values and causing adverse amenity impacts.
5. If one site is approved, other sites may then be approved, leading to a conglomeration of sites with concomitant adverse amenity and heritage impacts.
6. For residents living on the Woolloomooloo Finger Wharf, increased noise, traffic, and visually intrusive terminal will reduce their amenity.
7. Increased traffic movement such as 200 buses at 7am and then again at 1pm, with new passengers also arriving for the same vessels or other vessels will almost certainly create traffic gridlock on or near Garden Island and Potts Point, especially Macleay Street, the main arterial road, and Cowper Wharf Roadway [CWR]. Neither Sydney Council nor Carnival Australia has produced a Traffic Impact Study.
8. Large vessels create underwater waves causing sediment dunes. These require dredging from time to time. Recent dredging alongside CWR caused toxic sludge to be removed and noisy heavy industrial dredging equipment to be used seven days causing disturbance and abrasive odours. This dredging will be required more often with more ships using the site if Option C is approved.
9. Construction work will cause undue disruption.

See Attachment to this email showing Carnival Australia's Cunard Line QM II at Garden Island, Potts Point, on her last visit berthed adjacent to residents' homes: view from verandah looking north east.

This vessel overwhelms the area, looks directly into people's lounge and bedrooms and eliminates all views of the harbour. At the time, CWR was blocked off due to traffic snarls and then eventual gridlock. Only RAN vehicles were allowed through. These adverse impacts are unacceptable.

Heritage Impacts

Suggestions that removing the individually heritage-listed Hammer head crane is an option will create negative heritage impacts.

see National Trust of Australia (NSW) listing card

CWR is also heritage-listed. see:

http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/07_subnav_04_2.cfm?itemid=5055190

Loss of views to and from the harbour creates adverse heritage impacts. Such vistas are protected by the Harbour's heritage listing including "all the land that can be seen from the water and which provides a backdrop for diverse marine activities".

see:

http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl?mode=place_detail;search=place_name%3Dharbour%3Bkeyword_PD%3Don%3Bkeyword_SS%3Don%3Bkeyword_PH%3Don%3Blatitude_1dir%3DS%3Blongitude_1dir%3DE%3Blongitude_2dir%3DE%3Blatitude_2dir%3DS%3Bin_region%3Dpart;place_id=14308

In his review into the Environment Protection Biodiversity Conservation Act, publicly released on 21st December, 2009, Dr Allan Hawke stated then:

"Heritage should not be seen as a marginal activity" [ch 8 points 8-9]

" ... it needs to affirm its place as an integral part of the environment"

"Assessments should be based on the heritage significance of the place" [s 8.19]

" Values are inherent [in the] fabric of a place" [s 8.3.4.]

We agree with these statements and submit they also apply to this Review.

Heritage should not be compromised or threatened or reduced to build a terminal for a commercial shipping line at the expense of any community's amenity or heritage.

Carnival Australia brochure

Carnival Australia has provided us with a copy of 10-page colour A4 brochure headed "Carnival Australia Garden Island Review October 2011".

We submit:

Claims about emerging markets are spurious. A page 4 graph says a strong A\$ is driving change. And if the dollar devalues, what then?. The graph also shows that international trips have remained the same since 2007, hardly the growth patterns relied upon to warrant a new terminal. The page 5 headline "350% increase in capacity" is countered by the page 4 graph. Claims that "cruise shipping is making a growing economic contribution" are worthless. Property market values in Potts Point add more to the land value of the nation. They should not be reduced.

Claims that cruise shipping will make a "\$3 billion contribution to the national economy by 2020" are not backed up by any data.

It may be true that the majority of "international" brand ships are unable to pass under Sydney Harbour Bridge. So why build them, and why don't they make smaller ships? Or they should dock elsewhere. London, Venice, and Paris all have terminals an hour from the city by train. Up to 30% of passengers disembark at various ports: not all expect a grand Sydney Harbour entrance at the end of a world trip.

It is claimed that 65% of respondents to a survey thought it was "important" a new berth be available on the eastern side of the bridge [page 9 of brochure].

However, the graph provided shows only 30% thought it was very important. There is no indication of the methodology of the survey or its catchment. Was it passengers on board? In any event, none said such a terminal was absolutely necessary or vital to them or their trip. There is nothing in the survey provided to warrant an expensive new terminal paid for by taxpayers.

None of the page 10 conclusions are soundly-based.

A claim that "Almost nine out of ten respondents ... say it is very important or quite important to have cruise ships on Sydney Harbour" is not any justification for a new terminal at Garden Island. Cruise ships will still be on the harbour regardless.

General Conclusions

- 1 The Garden Island Proposal is recommended for rejection: there is inadequate planning
- 2 There will be losses of amenity
- 3 There are unresolved heritage impact issues
- 4 The proposal does not enhance the Potts Point area, itself a Council-listed Heritage Conservation Area
- 5 Traffic and acoustic impacts make the proposal untenable, unsustainable and unviable in our view.

Other options.

Carnival Australia is using the Athol Bouy in the middle of the harbour as an anchoring point. This may be a better solution.

In the *Australian Financial Review*, "Terminal plan lures architects", Thursday 22nd September, page 53, by Lisa Allen and Lisa Carapiet, Mr Dan Hanrahan, CEO, Celebrity Cruises remarks that "he would consider anchoring the liners at sea and using small boats to bring people to shore" and "we would consider Botany Bay ... especially because we want passengers buses to be able to turn around" [column 3 para 1], and "other options include looking at Brisbane as a home port" and/or reducing the number of tenants at Circulay Quay and expanding and modifying it.

These may be better options.

Our own overseas research points to the possibility of a new design, which we call the "big boomerang" because of its size and curved shape. It is being developed by a Dutch company using a Finnish designer.

In effect, it is a large pontoon alongside which the largest ships can be accommodated. The cost has not been finalised at this stage.

Such a pontoon could be constructed in Botany Bay, with unloading to nearby transport and airport links.

We have approached the designers and attach their replies for your information at **Appendix A** below. Please read these documents.

To see the design please go to:

<http://atelier29.blogspot.com/2009/09/floating-cruise-terminal-by.html>

and

<http://www.waterstudio.nl/videos/21>

Please advise if, for any reason these sites are unavailable - we will email an attachment for viewing, thank you

This may be a better option.

Recommendations

The Garden Island proposal be rejected.

The site has reached saturation point in terms of sustainable uses.

Residents already rightly complain of excessive noises, such as early morning [6:00am] on-deck commands "Officer Smith report to upper deck now!", construction works, dredging of toxic sludge, traffic congestion, large food and equipment delivery container-terminal trucks, sewage collection etc.

Many apartments are immediately adjacent to Cowper Wharf Road: noise travels across water like glass.

Increased use of Garden Island by cruise ships will exacerbate current and future adverse impacts and should be disallowed.

Other options be considered with viability studies provided for a more detailed analysis and assessment.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Woodhouse

President

Potts Point and King Cross Heritage Conservation Society

Saving our past for the future

Ph 0415 949 506