

**Port Botany Expansion
Community Consultative Committee**

Date: October 17, 2006

Meeting number: 2

Attendees:

John Burgess (JB) – Community Representative
 Nancy Hillier (NH) – Community Representative
 Neil Melvin (NM) – Community Representative
 Patrick Williams (PW) – Community Representative
 Paul Pickering (PP) – Community Representative
 Paul Shepherd (PS) – City of Botany Bay Council
 Robyn Eisermann (RE) – Randwick City Council
 Roberta Ryan – Chairperson
 Sandra Spate – Minute taker
 Colin Rudd (CR) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Kamini Parashar (KP) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Marika Calfas (MC) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Christa Sams (CS) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Mark Dickson (MD) – Maunsell
 Stefica Key (SK) – Maunsell
 Paula Sherry (PSh) - EDAW

Apologies: Neil Brener – Business Representative

Not present:

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
1	Welcome and introductions			
	Chair welcomed members			
2	Consultation Plan – Kamini Parashar			
2.1	<p>Sydney Ports' Consultation Plan for the project was presented outlining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation objectives • Consultation Principles for the project • Community stakeholders • Consultation tools • Action plan for next 3 months. <p>Information provided to meetings will be placed on website.</p> <p>Committee members' suggestions for a venue and for the format of the upcoming open day were sought.</p>			
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>			
2.2	NH asked whether licenses would be reviewed by the Community Consultative Committee.			

	<p>KP replied that the committee would review plans such as the Environmental, Traffic and Construction Plans and that all EPA licences would be publicly available and made available to the Committee.</p> <p>NH indicated that group would be keen to view Environmental Plans.</p> <p>KP noted these plans would come to the group.</p> <p>Designs for the public realm would be on public display at the open day.</p> <p>RE informed the meeting that relevant items could also be placed on Randwick Council website.</p>	SPC (KP) to contact RE about placing items on Council website.	SPC (KP)	Before next meeting.
2.3	<p>JB suggested late afternoon on a Saturday may be a suitable time for public displays and that they should be fairly close to the site.</p> <p>The group discussed the suitability of a shop front location in Botany for use by Sydney Ports for consultation with the local community.</p> <p>KP indicated that invitations to consultation events would be widely distributed, advertisements placed in papers, posters distributed, etc.</p>	SPC to investigate	SPC (KP)	To report at next meeting.
3	Presentation on Public Realm and Penrhyn Estuary Plan – Maunsell/EDAW. Plans were also handed out.			
3.1	<p>Presentation on Public Realm by EDAW representative (PSh).</p> <p>Masterplan 1 covers the Millstream area to the boat-ramp.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIS suggested rock wall at the western end. EDAW has designed a lookout at that area. • Landscaping would involve removal of existing weeds and vegetation planting. 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beach is to be enhanced. • Pedestrian overpass over Foreshore Road to be provided (location of pedestrian bridge still to be determined) <p>Masterplan 2 covers boat-ramp to Penrhyn Estuary lookout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erosion problems exist along foreshore. Proposal for a rock wall edge in this section 2m high. Vegetated dune between Foreshore Road and the rock wall would be about 30m wide. • Provision for pedestrian crossing across the road (new terminal access road) with cyclists encouraged to turn around with the provision of a loop. Pedestrian path to continue to the bird lookout. • Proposed bird lookout at estuary which will be closed at night. • Restoration of vegetation in this area. • Amenities building location as in EIS. Open style design with toilet blocks at end. Located centrally along foreshore. • Currently investigating location of footbridge, with possibility of more direct connection to Fremlin Street car park. 			
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>			
3.2	<p>PS asked whether the works would extend further west than the lookout point.</p> <p>CR noted that some work was on airport land, but work didn't extend past the lookout area as indicated in the EIS.</p> <p>JB noted that security fences prevented public access west of the lookout area.</p> <p>CR suggested that his understanding was for an eventual cycleway past airport and into Sir Joseph Banks Park connection but this was outside the scope of Sydney Ports works.</p>			
3.3	NH asked whether swimming would be			

	<p>allowed at the beach and asked whether water quality has been tested.</p> <p>PS suggested that that while swimming wasn't prohibited, currently water quality was not appropriate for swimming.</p>			
3.4	<p>JB asked Botany Council whether the existing carpark at the eastern end of Sir Joseph Bank's Park could be reopened. He expressed concern about the lack of parking for boat users and other recreational users of the area. He suggested safety issues may arise if vehicles are forced to try and park in Foreshore Drive.</p> <p>PS clarified that the existing carpark couldn't be used as it is currently used for council activities.</p> <p>CR noted JB's concerns, and suggested carparking facilities (Fremlin Street) in Sir Joseph Banks Park were in close proximity to the pedestrian crossing access to the beach.</p> <p>JB also asked whether extra carparking facilities could be placed at the Penrhyn estuary lookout.</p> <p>MD replied that this would not be possible as RTA requirements for acceleration and deceleration lanes and access needed to be taken into account and as well as ecological considerations.</p>			
3.5	<p>NH commented that the boat users were getting a lot of facilities, and this was not the case for beach users and other locals. NM agreed with this comment.</p> <p>NH asked what arrangements would be made for monitoring the toilet blocks at night.</p> <p>PS suggested that maintenance and security of the toilets would be a Sydney Ports responsibility.</p> <p>KP noted that the area around the boat</p>			

	<p>ramp would be used 24 hours a day due to tug boat related activity and therefore would have passive surveillance.</p> <p>NM suggested that a 600m walk from the lookout end of the beach was a long distance to the facilities.</p> <p>CR indicated this was similar to other beach locations.</p>			
3.6	<p>Presentation of Boat Ramp Design by Maunsell representative (MD).</p> <p>Boat ramp design presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carparking facilities • Boatlaunching facilities • Fish cleaning facilities. • There will parking for 130 cars with trailers. 			
	Questions and discussion			
3.7	<p>PP asked whether a board walk would be included at the boat ramp.</p> <p>MD suggested the design would cater for either board walk or footpath.</p>			
3.8	<p>PS asked what the capacity of the carpark would be.</p> <p>JB suggested there was a net loss of parking places since the Patricks expansion.</p> <p>CR responded this was not the case and that there would possibly be a net increase.</p> <p>PS asked how trucks would be prevented from parking here.</p> <p>CR noted that Sydney Ports would look at what measures could be adopted, including physical measures.</p>			
3.9	<p>Penrhyn Estuary Management Plan presentation by Maunsell representative (SK)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estuary currently provides habitat for migratory birds. The Plan's intent is to enhance this habitat. 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on 3 habitat types: seagrass, intertidal area and saltmarsh. • Updated mapping this year indicated a 50% reduction in seagrass cover. • Seagrass lost during the expansion will be transplanted at the western foreshore area. • Intertidal area will be expanded by excising dune. Expanded area for shore birds. Introduction of roosting islands. • Expanding saltmarsh area. Saltmarsh area affected by expansion will be transplanted. • Removal of mangroves which are competing with saltmarsh. 			
3.1.0	<p>NH asked whether an aggressive weed in the bay had been identified.</p> <p>SK noted that Taxifolia had been identified in studies and a management plan was being prepared for dealing with this in the dredging area.</p> <p>PP requested further details of the plan for managing the Taxifolia.</p> <p>MC indicated that chemicals would not be used in removing either the Taxifolia or the mangroves. Mangroves would be physically removed.</p> <p>JB suggested that dredging may improve conditions for the removal of Taxifolia.</p>			
3.1.1	<p>PS asked how the presence of toxic sediments in the estuary was being handled.</p> <p>SK responded that this sediment was would have minimal disturbance.</p>			
4	Contamination Report (geotechnical investigations)			
4.1	<p>Presentation by Sydney Ports outlining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sediment investigation and contamination results. • Dredging and reclamation area – sediments in exceedance of 			

	<p>contamination guidelines are not considered to be a threat to the local environment or human health as concentrations are relatively low and dredged material will be placed in the reclamation area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Penrhyn Estuary work will primarily involve covering sediment. Management plan would be put in place for this area. Long term access to area won't exist. The public will not be able to access this area. • Potential Acid Sulfate Soils have been found. Acid Sulfate Soil Management Plan will be prepared. • Odours detected during the investigation were mainly from organic matter. 			
4.2	<p>NH asked whether a health study was being done in relation to the sediment investigation, would sand be contaminated and where would dredged sand end up.</p> <p>CR indicated that the dredged sand would be used in construction of the new reclaimed area. It would be effectively sealed by the container terminal and pose no danger to health.</p> <p>CS advised the contaminants aren't highly soluble and therefore not a risk.</p> <p>During construction there will be some exposed material but at low levels of concentration.</p>			
4.3	<p>PW noted problems of the third runway and asked about whether the proposed port expansion would further impact on this.</p> <p>CR replied that sand was seeping out from the runway and that current repair work would be finished before dredging work started at the site.</p> <p>JB expressed concerns that dredging</p>			

	<p>and the movement of ships may undermine new wall.</p> <p>CR noted movement of water due to ships had been taken into account in design and construction and that evidence – for example at Brotherson Dock and Swanson Dock (Melbourne) suggests that this would not impact.</p> <p>PP asked whether there would be an increase in radar activity.</p> <p>CR noted that work is in progress to mitigate any potential radar interference.</p>			
4.4	<p>PS asked whether negotiations were taking place with Orica regarding their boreholes for testing.</p> <p>CS replied that discussions were taking place with Orica. Some monitoring boreholes would be affected but these would be replaced or relocated.</p>			
5	General Business			
5.1	<p>MC distributed plans and a cross-section showing depths, and indicative dredging layout in response to queries from the previous meeting about potential dangers of deep water at the beach.</p> <p>NH noted in the past Christmas tides had entered backyards of local residents.</p> <p>JB and NM requested further clarification.</p>	Sydney Ports to present a dredge profile at the next meeting to further clarify inquiries relating to dredging.	SPC (MC)	
5.2	<p>PP asked what measures would be in place to prevent future movement of sand.</p> <p>CR responded that a 'scour protection mattress' would be in place to inhibit sand movement due to propeller work but future maintenance dredging may also be required as it is in other locations.</p>			
5.2	NH asked that the committee be able to view the draft newsletter before it is	Sydney Ports to provide a	SPC (KP)	

	distributed	draft of the next newsletter to the committee prior to distribution for comment		
5.3	NM asked whether the issue of attendance by proxy members had been resolved. Chair indicated that her preference for the committee membership be kept stable with members being those who were appointed through the selection process, however individual cases could be raised with her.			
5.4	PP sought to clarify the issue of interference to radio waves in area from radar, noting that residents were currently affected. Is this likely to increase with expansion?	Sydney Ports to source information.	SPC	
	<p>Next Meeting - agenda items</p> <p>Groundwater presentation, including relevant extracts from EIS.</p> <p>MC requested input from members on what issues they would like addressed in relation to groundwater.</p> <p>JB asked that a DEC representative be invited to attend the meeting. MC responded that the need for a DEC representative would be determined following receipt of issues for discussion from the Committee.</p> <p>KP commented that presentations were not distributed in advance for members before tonight's meeting – however members could send comments on documents handed out and presentations made to KP.</p> <p>Chair asked that comments on tonight's material be forwarded to KP via email or phone on 9296 4995.</p> <p>Suggested date for next meeting: November 28, 4.00pm</p>	<p>Community members to provide input for issues around groundwater to be addressed.</p> <p>Sydney Ports establish need DEC representative to attend next meeting.</p>	<p>CCC members</p> <p>SPC</p>	

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R Ryan', followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.