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1. BACKGROUND

1.1. The Working Group Approach
In discussing the relative merits of the options for locating the Cruise Passenger Terminal ("CPT") at either Glebe Island or in White Bay, the CPT Working Group was limited by the lack of accurate data on relative costs and benefits of some of the options. The group was limited also by the lack of an overall strategy for the Bay Precinct forcing them to consider the CPT in isolation from other future developments.

There is a clear need for substantial infrastructure development to provide access to either CPT site but there were no figures available to the Working Group that would have assisted informed analysis of the relative merits of each in terms of costs and offsetting benefits.

Therefore, the following is a brief summary of positive and negative views expressed by Working Group members. A more detailed listing of views expressed by the individual members and organisations in the Working Group is attached as:
- Appendix A, summarising views from the final meeting of the Working Group and
- Appendix B, submissions made to the Working Group by individuals and organisations

These views are summarised under three headings.

- **Common Requirements.** Those needs that the group agreed were necessary for whichever site is selected.

- **The Glebe Island Option.** This is the less controversial choice but it carries a proviso that two ships can be accommodated (on around 5 days per year) without interruption to access to Rozelle and Blackwattle Bays.

- **The White Bay Option.** This location can accommodate two ships. It is the more controversial choice, with major differences of opinion between some residents and commercial interests who would welcome the improved infrastructure from the CPT and between groups of residents who claim that a White Bay CPT will have a negative impact on nearby residents.

Sydney Ports Corporation have stated that the CPT can be made to work at either Glebe Island or White Bay.

The Working Group saw the existing facilities at Barangaroo as satisfying the necessary criteria for a passenger ship terminal better than the Glebe Island or White Bay options. It is a purpose built terminal with access roads and transport immediately to hand and it is close to recognised tourist facilities.

However, the Minister has ruled that a passenger terminal will not be included in plans for that development and must be located at either Glebe Island or White Bay.
2. COMMON REQUIREMENTS

The Cruise Passenger Terminal Working Group identified the following requirements as being common to any of the possible sites for the terminal. They illustrate concerns of resident, commerce and recreational users of the precinct that the terminal may offer both opportunities for greater access as well as imposing a greater load on infrastructure that is already overloaded. The common needs fall into the following categories

2.1. Overall Concerns and Questions

- Neither location has infrastructure for a CPT – this will require significant investment of public money to avoid greater disruption to local traffic
- The arrival of two ships at once on a small number of occasions (5 days per season) is a management problem which needs to be resolved – options for location of a CPT should not be limited to choices based on this
- The facility for a second ship would be under-utilised and costs and associated investment may make it difficult to justify it as expenditure of taxpayer money

2.2. Community Consideration

- Any impacts on the residential community must be understood, quantified and addressed in any development plan and managed properly when the terminal is in operation.
- In being forced to select an alternate site, the community needs to be aware of the possible development of the alternative, ‘sister’ site. This calls for better information from government agencies.
- Residents generally support greater public access to the foreshore
- Public foreshore access is high priority
- Development should include green space and other public amenity for residents
- Residents believe the CPT should be accompanied by appropriate supporting infrastructure (roads, transport)
- Residents want issues arising from increased traffic (human and otherwise) such as security and noise adequately addressed

2.3. Improved Transport Infrastructure is Critical

- Government will have to make a serious investment in the CPT and all associated infrastructure (roads, rail etc) which already exists at Barangaroo.
- A Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) for each site that will cover needs for public transport, roads, access etc for each site.
- Public Transport is a must for either site option.
- Access for providers, taxis, coaches, service vehicles is needed

2.4. The Terminal Must Blend with the Community

- The terminal must fit with the topography
- Operating hours and traffic must fit with current and future peak traffic patterns
- Noise and light mitigation is required
- The impact of fumes and any other pollutants must be controlled
3.  THE GLEBE ISLAND OPTION

Glebe Island today is a large, flattened wharf area with existing commercial structures and wharf facilities for bulk sugar, cement and gypsum handling and storage. The possible CPT site is directly opposite the recent Jacksons Landing residential development on the northern end of the Pyrmont peninsular. It lies at the eastern approach to Rozelle and Blackwattle Bays which must be entered through one of two narrow navigation channels in the historic Glebe Island Bridge, which is no longer in use.

- The Glebe Island option is perceived to have the lower impact on residents in either Pyrmont or Balmain. The infrastructure development required for it is seen to have little benefit for the local community.

- However, the stated requirement that the CPT must accommodate two cruise vessels makes the location unattractive due to:
  - the limited length of the existing berth creating an overhang towards the entrance to White Bay
  - the 30 metre exclusion zone around two ships closing access though both navigation channels of Glebe Island Bridge
  - Negative impacts on recreational boating near ships

- Sydney Ports Corporation expressed the pragmatic view that only the western channel would be closed to vessels but that would need to be confirmed with and subject to rulings from the maritime security regulator, the Federal Office of Transport Security.

4.  THE WHITE BAY OPTION

White Bay is a waterway with its entry at its eastern end and bounded on all sides by existing wharf structures. Wharves that form the possible CPT site on its north-eastern side abut the residential suburb of Balmain. There are residences, located on a high escarpment adjacent to the working areas of northern wharves, whose occupants are concerned about noise and pollution that the CPT may bring.

- The White Bay option clearly demonstrates the capability of berthing two cruise ships of the size expected by the industry.

- However, it appears to be the more controversial option, with major differences of opinion between groups of residents concerned about negative impacts of a CPT and between some residents and commercial interests who would welcome the transport infrastructure that would be required for the CPT.

- The possibility of White Bay being used for maritime activities that may be more intrusive than a CPT has been canvassed within the Working Group. It appears that the opponents of a White Bay CPT are prepared to accept that risk against the prospect of greater possible foreshore access and increased green space.
APPENDIX A
Comments from participants at the final meeting of the Working Group
Cruise Passenger Terminal – Meeting

Time/date: 6.30pm, Monday, 22 November 2009

Venue: Balmain Town Hall Meeting Room

Attendees: John Stamolis (Chair), Jane Spring, Deirdre Coffey, Carolyn Allen, John Brooks, Elizabeth Elenius, Robert Gavagna, Shane Hobday, Michael Rolfe, Llew Russell, Mal Hiley, David Benson, Peter Johnson, Paul Cooper, Jane Marceau, Christina Ritchie, Kath Hacking, Val Moss

Economic benefit of cruise industry will be ‘east of the harbour’: The meeting opened with a short discussion about the economic value of cruise shipping to the NSW economy. Llew said that this was currently as high as $288 million for NSW and that passenger number had been growing at 18% pa, on average, over the past six years.

John said that in future years, 85% of cruise ship activity would be east of the harbour bridge (based on numbers provided – i.e. by 2023 382 ships will arrive and depart east and 68 west) and, as the ships east of the bridge would be bigger, it would be expected that over 90% of economic value-added from cruise shipping would be from ‘east of the harbour bridge’ not west. John said that cruise shipping is a ‘story’ about the east of the bridge not west and that it was important to acknowledge this before any further new CPT development occurred west of the bridge, as a large scale development is surely proposed for east of the bridge over the next few years.

Key issues

Jane Spring (Sydney University Rowing Club)
- Navigation and overhang
- Need to accommodate two vessels – makes White Bay more suitable
- Exclusion zone required around vessels
- Rowers must use Johnstons Bay – makes White Bay more suitable

Deirdre Coffey (City of Council – City Strategy and Design)
- Support comments made by Jane Spring. Particularly that access for passive and recreational craft to Rozelle and Blackwattle Bays needs to be maintained. The old Glebe Island Bridge should also be retained.
- Need to list key requirements for each site as feedback to Minister as CRG will not be choosing the final site but can inform the process with stakeholder requirements noted for each option.
- Key requirements would include the need for:
  - A Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) for each site – covers needs for public transport, roads, access etc for each site. Public Transport is a must for either site option.
  - Public foreshore access.
• A CPT could bring with it a variety of potential benefits and good uses. These should be located to maximise the benefits.
• Any impacts on the residential community must be understood and considered.

Carolyn Allen (Balmain Association)
• Agreement with statements made by previous two speakers
• There is a need for economic diversity in the Bays Precinct – including industry and commerce
• A CPT at White Bay would be best if this provides public transport solutions for the wider community – a ferry terminal at Glebe Island would provide little benefit for White Bay residents
• The shed should be removed
• Public access should be provided when the CPT is not in use
• if CPT is to be in White Bay & then it would be of benefit to provide infrastructure - namely road connect via James Craig Drive if CPT is to be in White Bay & then it would be of benefit

John Brooks (Blackwattle Bay Coalition)
• Need to list infrastructure requirements for each site and cost
• Do we need to consider a facility for two vessels at all? Couldn’t these small number of events be managed or accommodated in another way without restricting any decision to one site only.
• The investment in the facility for a second ship would be grossly under-utilised and difficult to justify as expenditure of taxpayer money
• We should detail what we want for each site and let government know.
• The structural integrity of Glebe Island bridge will be best maintained if it is closed rather than remaining open.

Elizabeth Elenius (Pyrmont Residents)
• In agreement with John Brooks
• Supports the use of the Bays Precinct by ships
• Residents are broadly supportive of a CPT at Glebe Island
• Glebe Island could be more attractive and have more potential from a tourist perspective

Robert Gavagna (Pyrmont Residents)
• Barangaroo satisfies the necessary criteria for a passenger ship terminal better than the white Bay or Glebe Island options (a purpose built terminal is already there, access roads and transport are immediately to hand).
• Other sites will need massive infrastructure and investment while Barangaroo already has this
• In being forced to select an alternate site, one needs to be aware of the possible development of the ‘sister’ site. This calls for information from government agencies. Glebe Island appears to be suitable for only one vessel at a time.
• We should be considering the wishes of passengers. Surely they prefer to arrive at Sydney CBD rather than White Bay or Glebe Island. After all, they are the target market!
Shane Hobday (Sydney Ports)
- Agree with the suggestion of the representative of the City of Sydney that the community should be listing their requirements/conditions against the two locations for the CPT.
- Either Glebe Island or White Bay have merits
- It is desirable for the location of the CPT to be able to accommodate two passenger ships alongside.
- CPT can be made to work in at either Glebe Island or White Bay.
- Glebe Island and White Bay are key deep water assets and therefore unlikely to be converted to public open space. As such the CPT maybe a softer/more benign use, from a community perspective, of either location than the other potential options.

Michael Rolfe (Defenders of Sydney Harbour)
- The arrival of two ships at once on a small number of occasions is a management problem which needs to be resolved – options for location of a CPT should not be limited based on this.
- If the two ships arrivals cannot be managed then White Bay would be the more functional option.
- Cruise ships are like hotels, they age and the quality of amenity reduces.
- The size of ships will increase over the years ahead – east of the bridge will become the centre of cruise ship activity.
- If there were a single-vessel CPT on Glebe Island then there would be no need to close the western passage of the bridge.
- We should start negotiating with the Navy for Garden Island.
- Glebe Island is the preferred location for the CPT. It offers scope for public transport, less distances, accommodates passenger need better.

Llew Russell (CEO, Shipping Australia)
- Darling Harbour has had two ship arrivals on around 5 occasions a year.
- Transport and road connections for a CPT must be carefully considered.
- There are international examples where cruise terminals are located in city locations.
- The requirement to accommodate two ships is important – the number of occasions will rise from 5 and then drop back again over the years to 2024.
- The ability to reschedule two arrivals at the same time is sometimes not easy to achieve.
- The terminal must fit with the topography.
- Noise and light mitigation is required.
- Access for providers, taxis, coaches, service vehicles is needed.
- Need to consider positive aspects of each site.
- While Garden Island might be an option, it may need to accommodate 2 Navy LHDs.

Mal Hiley (Sydney Harbour Maritime Forum)
- Proposed the principle of more active port use at Glebe Island and less active port related use at White Bay.
- The transport links to and from Glebe Island are better but would need to be improved for either site.
- CPT is a more active proposal and is better placed at Glebe Island.
- Need to consider the exclusion zone and navigation aspects.
• Need to consider impact on rowers
• Regarding the need for two ships, can vessel overhang into White Bay be accommodated so that Glebe Island is made suitable?
• White Bay needs isolation/separation given the proximity to residential community (i.e. noise, traffic and access)
• Robert Street (i.e. Balmain Peninsula) would not be viable to carry the traffic volumes associated with a CPT and alternate road would be needed

Peter (Verity Firths Office)
• Surveys conducted by Verity Firth earlier in the year among residents near White Bay found that:
• Local residents have a mixed view regarding a CPT at White Bay
• Residents believe there should be a planning framework
• Residents believe the CPT should be accompanied by appropriate supporting infrastructure (roads, transport)
• Some residents approve of demolishing the shed (Wharf 5)
• Residents generally support greater public access to the foreshore
• Residents want issues arising from increased traffic (human and otherwise) such as security and noise adequately addressed.

Jane Marceau (White Bay Joint Steering Committee)
• a CPT is a relatively benign form of shipping in that it is easier to regulate, is less polluting and less noisy than industrial shipping - passengers don't want noise or pollution any more than the residents nearby do. One of the requirements is for more stringent and coordinated measures to control noise and pollution. A CPT is easier to regulate than industrial shipping.
• if the CPT comes to White Bay its presence will mean that new infrastructure which benefits the whole community will have to be put in place. This will include improved traffic access and potentially bring more transport options such as a ferry service which is urgently needed as our area is not well served by public transport at present.
• A CPT could also encourage the building of the proposed White Bay metro station more quickly.
• If the infrastructure needed for the CPT is put on Glebe Island the local community will not benefit.
• It seems clear that two ships cannot fit on Glebe island.
• The local community needs access to the foreshore. At present we have none and the CPT should enable access at least when ships are not in port.
• A decision as to location cannot be made in the absence of indications of what other uses the site could be put to.
• Glebe Island is further from residences and any proposed industrial activities would be better placed there than so close to residences.
• A CPT in White Bay would exclude other forms of industrial activity which is highly desirable.
• A CPT at White Bay could encourage other benign development in the area, notably the Power Station as the infrastructure (notably public transport) would be better.

• Janes’ comment for further discussion:
• A CPT would preclude industrial activity from White Bay. Glebe Island would be used for industrial activity.
If the CPT is located at White Bay it would free Glebe Island for more intensive industrial activity such as a cement terminal, rock crushing, bulk-break cargo – these are the more noisy and polluting industries and should be located on Glebe Island

Paul Cooper (Chairperson, White Bay Joint Steering Committee)

- Two vessels cannot fit Glebe Island
- Neither location has infrastructure for a CPT – this will require significant investment of public money
- Any infrastructure on Glebe Island would service Glebe Island only whereas any new infrastructure at White Bay would also serve and benefit the wider community and contribute to its use. Such infrastructure should include a ferry service to White Bay, Metro Rail station, Light Rail and most importantly, access to the additional road infrastructure that will be required.
- The Circular Quay model should be implemented & public access to the foreshores should be permitted whenever a vessel is not in Port.
- There are significant concerns about noise associated with the CPT. Noise mitigation measures must be put in place.

David Benson (Architect – Balmain/Rozelle)

- There are sound arguments for keeping the CPT at Barangaroo
- In addressing the fundamental requirement for 2 ships in port at any given time, White Bay is more suitable than Glebe Island.
- Although Glebe Island could accommodate 2 ships there are obvious issues pertaining to ship overhang and the impact that the 30m exclusion zones have on the greater Bays Precinct, as demonstrated in the studies presented.
- If the CPT was to be located at White Bay, then transplanting the current Wharf 8 terminal model is undesirable as it is a docile structure and would contribute little to the peninsula should it replicated at White Bay.
- The preferred model for White Bay would be the OPT at Circular Quay.
- Public access to the foreshores is important and there is greater opportunity for achieving this if the OPT model was to be adopted at White Bay as opposed to other possible land uses.
- There is potential for the reuse rather than demolition, of the existing building at White Bay Wharf 5. The existing structure (adapted) could support multiple uses, rather than the single use of a CPT.
- The existing Wharf 8 terminal has a building footprint of approx. 5,580m². The existing structure at White Bay Wharf 5 has a building footprint of approx. 12,500m².
- Again the possibility of adaptive reuse of the existing structure should therefore be considered for multiple uses.
- To locate the CPT in White Bay may provide a platform for the CRG to argue against governments ill considered decision to locate Baileys at White Bay Wharf 6.
- White Bay is the preferred location for the CPT for a multiple of reasons including economic, employment and much needed public transport alternatives for the peninsula
- Given the option between Glebe Island and White Bay, it is the position of the Balmain Rozelle Chamber of Commerce that White Bay is the preferred location.
Kath Hacking (Chair, White Bay Precinct Committee)

- Kath explained that she has lived in the immediate area for 35 years and has been adversely impacted by working harbour activities over many years.
- Key impacts were noise, fumes and pollution.
- CPT would bring a range of noise: operations, boat, public address system, traffic.
- The area is in a ‘valley’, hence an amphitheatre effect exacerbates noise.
- White Bay area has 16 times the rate of noise complaints when compared with Darling Harbour.
- Air pollution will continue to be a problem – near residential. This would also exacerbate existing inner-city smog and pollution.
- Over the years, noise controls were useless as it is very difficult or almost impossible to control noise from port activity. Sydney Ports could not control noise while EPA tried but failed.
- The environment is less polluted since the end of working harbour.
- Health has improved since the end of working harbor.
- The White Bay topography is like a ‘valley’ where pollution can settle and noise cannot escape.
- Truck deliveries and servicing would commence very early in the morning (about 5.00am).
- If a CPT was located at White Bay the impact of the enormous traffic volumes on the Balmain Peninsula would create gridlock.
- In the 1980s Council conducted two important traffic studies which detailed the impact of development on traffic.
- The large shed at White Bay should be demolished. It contains asbestos.
- Two ships arriving at White Bay will create huge volumes of traffic and CPT activity. A two ship scenario is a case against White Bay not for it.
- There has been no approval of the Metro.
- Government should not be wasting money on a cruise terminal that already exists and functions well at Barangaroo. This money could be spent on other important objectives such as health and education.
- The CPT should stay at Barangaroo but otherwise must go to Glebe Island if all else fails.

Val Moss (Chair, Balmain Precinct)

- To force the CPT to be located at White Bay based on 3-5 dual ship arrivals per year is ludicrous. This must be managed and planned better.
- There has been a history of noise coming from the wharves and it cannot be stopped. A Noise Reference Committee was set up by Sydney Ports to respond to community concerns about noise. EPA had no effect at all. P&O were driven crazy by the ongoing complaints from the community.
- At White Bay, the CPT would be too close to residences.
- Residences along the Balmain Peninsula are old. These residences do not have the double-glazing that Pyrmont residences have.
- Noise will emanate from the CPT itself (i.e. operational noise) and from traffic.
- There will always be noise problems of boats working at WB due to the wharf lying below the escarpment.
• Changes to Robert Street could create problems for traffic on the wider Balmain Peninsula
• Leichhardt Municipality has the second lowest open space ration in Sydney. We need more green space. It is time to respond to the needs of needs of the growing populations.

Christina Ritchie (Chair, White Bay Residents Consultation Group)
• Barangaroo is the logical choice for a CPT. There are no arguments against it. The location is better (from an industry perspective and community perspective). The infrastructure is already there.
• At White Bay, a CPT will bring a range of problems to the residential peninsula – noise, traffic volumes. Traffic past residences will be relentless (i.e. taxis, buses and coaches, supply vehicles, staff vehicles).
• To select White Bay because of two boat arrival 3-5 times a year ignores the impacts on residences, traffic and fails to recognise that the infrastructure requirements would be much cheaper if the CPT were on Glebe Island (i.e. road).
• For those 3-5 arrivals, other options must be first considered. There are: rescheduling or finding another location.
• the industry is set to expand east of the harbour bridge. An investment west of the bridge could be a waste. Leave the CPT at Barangaroo a few years more until this is better known.
• Open space and foreshore access should be created at White Bay where it is closest to residences who can make use of this.
• If the CPT is not located at White Bay this would enable other better uses of this site with less impact on residences.
• White Bay is already facing significant development (Martin-Bright Steel Building and the White Bay Power Station). It cannot cope with more.

John Stamolis (Councillor, Leichhardt Council)
• The CPT should remain at Barangaroo. It is already there and operates well. It is the right location for the cruise industry, passengers and tourist related businesses around The Rocks and Darling Harbour.
• Government would have to make a serious investment in the CPT and all associated infrastructure (roads, rail etc) when it already exists at Barangaroo.
• Leichhardt Council resolution passed by all political entities is that “Council has serious concerns about the operation of a CPT at White Bay.”
• No recreational or passive use of the Bays Precinct is available in the Leichhardt Municipality. This includes the whole of White Bay, the whole of Glebe Island, much of Rozelle Bay and the whole of the Rozelle Marshalling yards.
APPENDIX B
Individual Submissions
From participants in the Working Group
CPT relocation – Submission from Balmain Peninsula Precincts

It has been clarified that 2 vessels will arrive at a Cruise Passenger Terminal west of the bridge at most 3-5 times a year. This is not a good enough argument to base a decision for the CPT to be at White Bay rather than Glebe Island or Barangaroo. Why must White Bay bear the brunt of a permanent terminal all year round on that basis? Rescheduling can be considered or other locations for the second vessel.

On those few occasions when, if necessary, alternative arrangements should be investigated. This includes:
* special circumstances so that a second ship can be accommodated at Glebe Island,
* possibly utilising Circular Quay or Garden Island or Darling Harbour?
* rescheduling of ships to one of the many days that a cruise ship will not be at GI

Impacts on local area if at White Bay - residential area:

**Noise:** This is a sensitive issue for residents of White Bay, Balmain and Balmain East. These are high density residential suburbs. The history of noise problems is extensive and well documented. It was so bad at one stage that a Noise Reference Committee was needed. Many homes were affected.

Noise studies identified higher than acceptable levels in the surrounding area but nothing was done to alleviate the problem. The committee was ineffectual and closed down - the issue was not properly addressed.

So what hope is there for managing the noise from a CPT with associated events centre uses in a satisfactory way? There is the problem of the topography at WB. There is a strong amphitheatre effect from any noise on the wharfs at White Bay – noise is amplified as it rises up the escarpment. Reflection of noise spreads it even further into the residential area. The surfaces all reflect sound (water, concrete, escarpment and building surfaces).

The noise emanates not only from one source – the ship, but also from all the other associated operations, supply and exchange of goods, taxis, coaches, supply vehicles all running along the length of White Bay to the ships, past residences.

The level of complaints will rise significantly if the CPT were to be relocated to White Bay. Does Sydney Ports really want that in preference to an option that would not create these problems?

The local State member saw the need to request that activity be reduced so as not to create problems during the trial earlier this year. Even so unacceptable noise still affected local residents.

**Traffic:** Traffic problems already exist for people accessing and egressing from the peninsula. In order to deal with a major increase in traffic as a result of the CPT at White Bay major and expensive infrastructure would have to be provided. This would be less of a problem at Glebe Island.
Peak hour traffic load (morning and evening) would be severely compromised if the CPT were at White Bay.

With 2 other major developments proposed for White Bay – Martin Bright Steels Site and White Bay Power Station – a CPT is not needed to justify a light rail and ferry terminal at White Bay - these are the preferred public transport options to help alleviate traffic congestion.

There are no guarantees at all that the necessary infrastructure for a CPT will be provided as it would come at considerable cost. If the CPT remained in DH this expensive infrastructure would not be required. Even at Glebe Island it would be less difficult and the traffic impacts would not be as great as at White Bay.

**Hours of operation** – Assuming a ship arrives at 6 or 7 in the morning, this means that service vehicles and staff would start arriving an hour or so earlier than this. So we could be looking at 5 am as a start time of the disruption.

**Fumes from generators**: NE prevailing winds drive these into the surrounding residential area and it gets trapped there.

**Exclusion zone** - It has been stated that the CPT would create an exclusion zone on the foreshore. It is undesirable to have an exclusion zone on the foreshore of the residential area at White Bay while having the inaccessible foreshore of Glebe Island as public access.

WB is already facing **2 other major developments** at White Bay – these are the Martin-Bright Steels site Development and the White Bay Power Station. These alone will create unprecedented strain on the area.

The CPT as well as the Baileys development would mean **built structures** along much of the foreshore of a residential area.

The extra uses such as an **Events and Conference centre** would be restricted at White Bay due to the proximity to residences and disruption to residents from traffic travelling along the length of the foreshore. Hours of use would be restricted so as not to cause unreasonable disturbance.

**Cost**, White Bay most, Glebe Island less. The extra cost of necessary infrastructure for a CPT at White Bay would be borne by the taxpayer. Alternative thinking can avoid this. Obviously keeping the CPT at East Darling Harbour would avoid this. Barangaroo is still the preferred option and this should not be forgotten.

Also we need to consider the future of the cruise ship industry. By far the majority of ships will need to be berthed east of the bridge. The number west of the bridge is likely to diminish over time. So why not keep the smaller ones at EDH and then incorporate them in a purpose-built facility that can cope with the vast majority of ships - the larger ones and also the smaller number of smaller ships on one site east of the bridge, or keep a smaller facility at EDH indefinitely and continue to use Circular Quay as well. This would seem to be a more cost-effective solution.
Minister Keneally gave us the option in her statements of deciding where, west of the bridge a CPT should be located. The idea that the choice is between GI and WB only has arisen subsequently and should not restrict our deliberations.

**Large Shed** – adaptive reuse of the huge shed is totally unacceptable to the local community that has been asking for this little-used and contaminated building to be removed from the harbour foreshore of a residential area.

**Baileys/CPT, interference** – unworkable. If the Baileys refuelling and industrial facility for wharf 6 proceeds as approved by the Minister against strong, valid opposition, then to have this multi-operational facility, which the proponent intends to expand onto wharf 5, with boats lining up for refuelling, maintenance work and sewage pump-out and more, would render wharf 5 unsuitable for a CPT. The interference, risks of collision and fire risks from the large fuel tanks, the unpleasant nature of the facility from a tourist viewpoint, would make wharf 5 an unacceptable location for the CPT.

**Amenity** - recreational and passive use of the Bays Precinct is not available in the Leichhardt Municipality. This includes the whole of White Bay, the whole of Glebe Island, much of Rozelle Bay and the whole of the Rozelle Marshalling yards. It would be desirable to have passive recreation at White Bay, a residential area.

**Green space** - There is no green space at all along the foreshore and a CPT would preclude this desirable option for the foreshore of a residential area.

**Economic benefit is east** - any economic benefit argument for the terminal being at White Bay is not valid – By far the greatest economic contribution will come from the big ships with lots of passengers that will berth east of the bridge. This will become more and more the case.

**Expansion of associated facilities** – easier at Glebe Island and of course already exists at East Darling Harbour. Other tourist attractions could be added at Glebe Island, where there is plenty of space but not appropriate or feasible along the foreshore of White Bay.

**Final Comment**: Community preferences should be paramount in our deliberations – not industrial, government agencies or private interests. The WB foreshore is public land in a fast-growing residential area. Nor should any decision on use of this area be controlled by private interests.

Christina Ritchie  
Sec White Bay Precinct  
Per Balmain and White Bay Precincts
Submission from Mr John Paul (Dockers Plains)

- If this is the case, clearly White Bay is the only choice as the Glebe Island berths with ships and the legally required exclusion zone will block any access through the Glebe Island Bridge to Rozelle and Blackwattle Bays. This will apply to all water traffic whether it be recreational, commercial, rowers, dragon boaters etc. There is simply not enough room as cruise boats appear to have a beam of some 30m.

- Additionally two large boats end to end cannot be accommodated at Glebe Island without some overhang. While this is not necessarily fatal it is undesirable.

- Cruise boats by their nature are a benign form of large shipping. Any noise generated by these ships is as unwelcome to their passengers as it is to residents.

- The arrival and departure of cruise ships in daylight hours morning and evening is in marked contrast to industrial shipping which can and does arrive, depart and operate 24/7. Industrial shipping is usually noisier.

- My initial and early preference for White Bay as the location was more for the benefits that cruise boats can bring rather than anything else. These benefits still apply.

- If it is to operate satisfactorily the CPT demands that another point of access and egress be created. The Victoria Road/Robert Street intersection is already at or near capacity.

- If White Bay is to be the location the newly created access will have the added benefit of serving those that live on the Balmain Peninsula - improved access to Glebe Island will have no additional benefit to the local population.

- The obvious, and low cost, points of additional access are through the portals of the Victoria Road Bridge (similar to Sydney Ports mooted road/rail link but with public access) and the extension of Mullens Street to James Craig Drive adjacent the silos.

- Another (but less favourable) option is for the RTA to increase the capacity of the Victoria Road/Robert Street intersection by building additional slip lanes with the already fully subscribed S94 contributions raised for that purpose.

- Likewise additional transport infrastructure, ferries, buses, metro and light rail will service an existing population.

- Further advantages of White Bay:

  - The existing large building at Berth 5 can be adaptively reused as a terminal whilst retaining an historic connection to the ports’ industrial past.

  - The 12m – 15m escarpment adjacent Berth 5 will significantly buffer and deflect noise from the existing residential area.

  - Public access to the foreshore can be given in the same way as it is at the Overseas Cruise Terminal in Circular Quay. As this is a domestic terminal Customs and Immigration requirements are not of high priority requiring special facilities.

  - The reactivation and refurbishment of the White Bay waterfront leading to the Power Station has the ability to become a much improved and recognised precinct with flow on cultural, tourist and economic benefits for the local and wider community.

  - There are clearly additional infrastructure, transport, harbour access, visual, environmental and economic benefits that flow from placing this facility adjacent to an existing population rather than locating it in isolation on Glebe Island. All in all it is a better and more efficient use of public resources and money.
Mr Paul Cooper (White Bay Joint Steering Committee) – Paper:

A site for the ‘permanent’ location of the ‘Domestic’ Cruise Ship Terminal.

Should it be Glebe Island 1 & 2 or White Bay 5 & 4?

Background Brief #1
Both the ‘domestic’ & part of the ‘international’ cruise vessels operate from the Overseas Passenger Terminal located at Darling Harbour Wharf #8. ‘International’ cruise vessels in excess of 50 metres above waterline cannot pass under the Sydney Harbour Bridge and hence, predominately berth at International Cruise Terminal at Sydney Cove.

Minister’s Brief
The OPT facility operating from Darling Harbour Wharf #8 is to be relocated to allow the Barangaroo development to proceed. It is to be relocated to White Bay 5 & 4 for approximately 5 years. However, the government wishes to firstly determine a site for a ‘permanent’ location for the ‘Domestic’ Cruise Terminal and hence the Minister has asked all of NSW their opinion as to whether it should be located at either Glebe Island or White Bay. The site must accommodate 2 vessels at any one point in time.

Background Brief #2
White Bay & Glebe Island Master Plan presently allows a maximum of 4 ships at any one point in time in White Bay Berths 3-6 & 8 vessels at any one point in time in both the White Bay & Glebe Island berths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berth Location</th>
<th>Berth Number</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Waterline Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glebe Island</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>234 metres &amp; 11.9 metres deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>234 metres &amp; 12 metres deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>229 metres &amp; 11.4 metres deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>120 metres &amp; 9.3 metres to 6.6 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Bay</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>265 metres &amp; 10.9 metres deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>203 metres &amp; 11 metres deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>203 metres &amp; 11 metres deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Cove</td>
<td></td>
<td>300 metres &amp; 10.5 metres deep.</td>
<td>Other info Customs Hall 1,462 sq metres, Passenger Lounge 465 sq metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling Harbour</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>335 metres &amp; 10.2 metres deep.</td>
<td>maximum vessel length allowed is 300m. Customs Hall 1,500 sq metres, Passenger Lounge 900 sq metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All vessels must retain a 10% draft (a 10m draft requires a depth of 11 metres). Therefore, based on the depth the largest of the currently frequented vessels draw, a minimum of 9.02 metres will be required.
Background Brief #3
Over riding requirement is that the Sydney Harbour Bridge has a maximum of 53.4 metre clearance for shipping at Indian Spring Low Water at the centre (lowest tide) but effectively built for a 49 metre clearance. Any vessel travelling under the Sydney Harbour Bridge in excess of 49 metres, requires clearance. The P&O Pacific Dawn is the largest vessel presently entering into Darling Harbour #8 & it sits 49.4 metres above the water line and needs clearance although it does have the ability to lower its antennas bringing it below the 49m requirement.

Climate change predictions on Sydney Harbour predict a rise in the sea level which will reduce the maximum height of any vessel travelling under the Sydney Harbour Bridge. Therefore, vessels over time will need to be smaller than 49 metres above water line to travel under the SHB.

There are 45 cruise vessels currently under construction throughout the world none of which, when completed, will fit under the Sydney Harbour Bridge.

Background Brief #4
The main cruise lines using Darling Harbour #8 are the P&O Cruise Lines, Princess Cruises & Oceania Cruises. Vast majority though comes from the P&O Line of which they presently run 2 cruise ships the Pacific Dawn & the Pacific Sun. A third vessel, the Pacific Jewel is about to be introduced in December 2009 (first cruise in January 2010) & a 4th, the Pacific Pearl in late 2010. It appears both these new vessels will replace the existing cruise ships.

Relevant information on these vessels are as follows:

- Pacific Dawn  245.1 metres length, 32.25 metres beam & 7.9 metres draught. Launched 1990, approx 70,000 tons & accommodates a maximum 1910 passengers.
- Pacific Sun  223.4 metres length, 28.2 metres beam & 7.5 metres draught. Launched 1985, 46,262 tons & accommodates a maximum 1,486 passengers.
- Pacific Pearl  284 metres length, 32 metres beam & 8.2 metres draught. Launched 1988, 63,500 tons & accommodates a maximum 1,856 passengers.
- The Princess Line Sun Class Vessels are as follows:
  - Sun Princess  261m length, 32m beam, 8.1 metre draught. Launched 1995, 77,499 tons & accommodates a maximum 1,950 passengers
  - Dawn Princess  260 m length, 32.2 m beam & 7.9 m draught. Launched 1997, 77,499 tons & accommodates a maximum 1,950 passengers
  - Coral Princess  294 m length (rest unknown) Launched 2002, 91,627 tons & accommodates a maximum 1,970 passengers
  - Island Princess  294 m length (rest unknown) Launched 2003, 91,627 tons & accommodates a maximum 1,970 passengers
- The Car Carriers were essentially the same beam size (32m to 32.6m) and ranged in length of 180m to 200m & draughts of 7.9m to 8.2m. Car carrier vessels would frequently berth on Glebe Island at the same time. Obviously being smaller, they could fit.
Background Brief #5
The old Glebe Island Bridge has 2 passages. The western side (closest to GI) has, until recently, been closed to commercial vessels. Legislation requires there to be a 30 metre ‘exclusion’ zone from all cruise vessels unless piloted by approved pilots. Commercial & pleasure craft vessels including rowers are not permitted to traverse within 30 metres of a berthed cruise ship. Hence, when berthed, from wharf to the end of the water exclusion zone, is, based on the largest of the current vessels, 62.2 metres from shore. Effectively, if 2 cruise vessels were to be berthed at Glebe Island at the same time, no other vessel, including rowers or recreational craft, could legally enter Rozelle Bay. This could however be alleviated if the old Glebe Island Bridge was demolished and the channel made wider.

Background Brief #6
The ‘Swing Basin’ in Johnstons Bay is 300 metres diameter. This area is reserved for vessels to effectively, ‘turn around’.

Background Brief #7
The cruise industry is presently the fastest growing segment in tourism. By 2023, it is forecasted that cruise ships could possibly reach to 450 per annum of which 85% of the cruise ships will be unable to sail under the Sydney Harbour Bridge. Based on this prediction, the site reserved for cruise vessels west of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, should accommodate approximately 68 vessel movements per year.

Background Brief #8
The Metro Rail tunnel is proposed to be constructed under Glebe Island alongside Glebe Island # 1. The Pacific Jewel, the largest of the current P&O Fleet that will frequent this facility, is approximately 70,310 tons. If berthed at Glebe Island 1, there will be approximately 3.7 metres from the bottom of the vessel to the sea bed. The Metro tunnel is approximately 12 metres below the sea bed. This

Background Brief #9
Though not necessary, it is preferable to the cruise industry to sail ‘stern’ first into berth. This allows the vessel to ‘power out’ which is faster & quieter. This should be noted as a requirement for whichever site is chosen as it will improve the amenity of those residents in the closest proximity to the Passenger Terminal.

Background Brief #10
There is not sufficient infrastructure in either of the sites to accommodate neither a permanent site of the ‘domestic’ cruise terminal nor the ‘short term’ accommodation of the domestic & some international cruises. The present (though largely accepted to be ‘out of date’) White Bay & Glebe Island Master Plan provides for an internal road to predominately benefit the berths at White Bay & this road proposes to provide another entry into and out of the ports.

Background Brief #11
White Bay 5 & 4 has a building which might possibly be adaptively reused to accommodate a Cruise Ship Terminal. Based on the current terminals in Sydney Harbour, the facility available in White Bay for adaptive reuse is approximately 65% larger than those presently in use.
Background Brief #12
If a vessel is berthed at Glebe Island, the proximity of the closest residents is approximately 132 metres.
If a vessel is berthed at White Bay 5, the proximity of the closest residents is approximately 129 metres.

Background Brief #13
Sydney is a city constantly under construction. Sydney is running out of sand, cement & aggregate. It is predicted that the areas of the berths in White Bay & Glebe Island not used by the cruise industry, will, in the future, be used to facilitate the transportation and importation of sand, cement & aggregate and other industrial goods.

Background Brief #14
Direct and indirect cruise-related expenditure in Australia in the 2006-07 fiscal year totalled $734 million; within this total, the economic activity relating to days spent at Australian ports accounted for $522 million, while other expenditure on cruise line offices, repairs, maintenance, travel agents, call centres, advertising and marketing is estimated to be $212 million.
Splitting the total of $734 million another way, direct cruise-related expenditures were $382 million and the flow-on impact from indirect expenditures by supplying industries (such as fuel suppliers, food suppliers, tour operators and travel agents) totalled $352 million. Of the $522 million of direct and indirect expenditure related to when ships are at port, NSW (of which 99% was in Sydney) attracted $228 million and Queensland (of which 81% was in Brisbane) attracted $164 million in 2006-07.
During 2006-07 direct and indirect value added by the cruise industry (ie expenditure less raw materials) was $343 million. Value added is the most appropriate quantity to use when making comparisons with GDP.
In the 2007-2008 year, the Australian Cruise Industry accounted for an economic impact of $828 million. Based on the same economic benefit, NSW attracted approximately $256 million.
Based on the predicted growth in the industry, the benefit to NSW will grow enormously (85% of which the vessels will berth east of the Sydney Harbour Bridge).

Background Brief #15
If located at White Bay, the facility would have less impact on the more passive users of the waterways (notably rowers).

Analogy #1
Cruise vessels are being constructed larger and the numbers of vessels able to sail under the Sydney Harbour Bridge will reduce. This is evidenced by the fact that none of the vessels under construction can sail under the Sydney Harbour Bridge & the ‘newest’ cruise vessel proposing to use the facility (west of the Bridge) yet not having sailed its ‘maiden’ voyage, is 20 years old. From world cruise ship standards, it is a vessel that has been decommissioned from the lucrative world cruises.

Analogy #2
The Minister’s brief is that the site must accommodate 2 cruise vessels at any one point in time. If 2 vessels were to berth at Glebe Island, it would close all vessel traffic (including rowing & recreational) into and out of Rozelle & Blackwattle Bay. This is unless the pilot
of the vessel is prepared to defy the law or the old Glebe Island Bridge is demolished and the channel widened. Given the amount of recreational and commercial traffic (including the marine traffic soon to be generated from the recent marine facilities alongside Glebe Island Berth #1 & the approval of other marine facilities in Rozelle & Blackwattle Bay) that use or will use this channel, based on the legal requirement of a 30m ‘exclusion zone’, a cruise terminal located at Glebe Island would be inappropriate.

It is not appropriate we condone any recommendation that requires someone to ‘break the law’.

Based on the above, if Glebe Island and White Bay were to be the only two options of a ‘permanent’ ‘Domestic’ Cruise Ship Terminal, Glebe Island should be excluded. The facility should be located at White Bay 5 providing a second berth when required at White Bay 4.

Requirement #1
Whichever location is chosen, a ‘permanent’ Cruise Ship Terminal West of the Sydney Harbour Bridge will be a public tourism facility predominately for the benefit of residents and economic activity of NSW.

Based on this, a requirement of the Community would public be that access should also be allowed along the waterfront to all residents of NSW whenever a vessel is not berthed at the facility.

Requirement #2
To be acceptable to Tourism & the Cruise Ship industry, a move to either Glebe Island or White Bay will require significant improvements to public transport & road infrastructure. If White Bay 5 & 4 (as the 2nd Vessel location) were to be selected, new roads will need to be constructed to accommodate an increase in traffic. These roads would be for the ‘public’ use of the facility.

A requirement of the Community would be to also allow connection of relevant roads of Balmain & Rozelle to any new entry & egress on and off the Balmain peninsula.

Requirement #3
Cruise Industries provide a ‘ferry shuttle service’ for their passengers to shuttle them to ‘places of interest’. If 2 vessels were berthed at Glebe Island at the same time, there appears to be no room to provide a ‘shuttle’ facility to take passengers to say, Circular Quay or the Zoo.

There is however sufficient space at White Bay and there is no reason why there shouldn’t be a ‘permanent’ ferry stop in this area.

As part of any approval, a requirement of the Community would be to construct, provide and also allow the public use of ferry terminals in this area.

Requirement #4
The Sydney Metro Rail to Rozelle is fully funded & apparently, about to commence. A White Bay Metro station has been proposed which will potentially be an advantage to the Cruise Industry customers. To be more viable to the industry & the Sydney Metro Rail, access to this facility should be available to the local community.

As part of any approval, a requirement of the Community would be to construct and allow the public use of the White Bay Metro Rail Terminal by 2015.
**Requirement #5**
The Light Rail is an important infrastructure that can possibly link the Cruise Terminal to any public transport facility to any location in NSW. A proposal under consideration is to run a Light Rail service from Dulwich Hill to Lilyfield. To be more viable, consideration should be given to running this infrastructure through to White Bay & the Cruise Ship Terminal. The viability of this infrastructure would be further enhanced if made available to the local community.

As part of any approval, a requirement of the Community would be to construct and also allow the public use of the ‘White Bay’ Light Rail station and any improved public transport facilities in this area.

**Requirement #6**
Though the Cruise Vessel Industry is passive & in comparison to other ‘industrial’ vessels, is the most ‘clean’, by the nature of its business, all vessels can create noise. White Bay 5 has a building that could possibly be adaptively reused and an escarpment both of which would provide a noise buffer. Irrespective of that, the Minister & the Industry must recognise that ‘noise’ is a particularly sensitive issue for the local community.

As part of any approval, a requirement of the Community would be to provide maximum sound insulation and have strict noise requirements in place that is also monitored electronically on behalf of, and for the Community & the State.

**Requirement #7**
The Bays Precinct combines waterways that are and will continue to be used by industry, commercial, recreational & passive users. Speed & wake can affect all users.

As part of any approval, a requirement of the Community is to restrict all users of the waterways of the Bays Precinct to 4 Knots and it is monitored by way of fixed video surveillance & speed cameras.