



Boating Industry Association

Comment and submission on the
State Environmental Planning Policy (Environment) - Explanation of Intended Effect

The Boating Industry Association (BIA) welcomes the release for comment of the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Environment) - Explanation of Intended Effect*.

We support the clear intent of the document to reduce unnecessary regulation and streamline planning processes, particularly for developments within and adjacent to the State's waterways. The NSW recreational and light commercial boating sector, which represents significant economic and social value, relies on pragmatic and sustainable land-use planning provisions.

In **summary** there are three key issues for the BIA:

1. The need for better guidance on how to balance concepts of the public good and protection of natural assets. By longstanding government policy, boating infrastructure is primarily provided by private investment in the facilities that allow the public to access the water. The fact that infrastructure is privately owned does not mean that it is not in the public interest, particularly when it provides the gateway to the harbour for the public. This policy has been reconfirmed in recent years by the implementation of the Sydney Harbour Destinations Plan, whereby rental reductions are provided to commercial leaseholders in return for public access to facilities.

2. The need for a 'sanity check' of the proposed changes to the SEPP to ensure that the necessary facilities to maintain and improve the quality of boating can be developed, within the terms of the SEPP. The planning risk taken by the private sector to provide these facilities is unacceptable, and the millions of dollars spent in legal contest has shown the impact of poor planning rules. Prior to finalising the SEPP, since it did not happen before finalising the draft, a workshop with industry should be held to confirm that there are planning pathways for the needed facilities. Changes to the zone definitions need close attention in this workshop.

3. To ensure the preservation of sufficient sites for facilities to allow the harbour to work. Boat yards, slipways, marinas, jetties, ramps, clubhouses, and berths need to be protected from encroaching residential development, or naïve 'return to nature' desires. The growth in accessible tourist operations and commuter services creates a growth in places for bigger vessel storage, but this is happening precisely at the time when residential development is moving into old working harbour sites – without replacement sites in place.

Below we describe the importance of these issues to boaters, and to the **many boating businesses** which provide services to them; identify **general comments** on the EIE; and some **specific detailed comments** on proposed sections.

We look forward to further discussion on the proposals.

30/1/18

Howard Glenn
Chief Executive Officer

National Office

PO Box 1204 Crows Nest NSW 1585 • T. (02) 9438 2077

Offices in: Brisbane • Gold Coast • Adelaide

www.bia.org.au info@bia.org.au

ABN 61 000 618 462

General comments

There are 17,500 registered recreational vessels around Sydney Harbour, with government predictions of potential growth to 21,500 by 2026. Sydney Harbour is the premier boating destination for tourists and locals alike. Ferries and charter boats take over 17 million passengers each year on Sydney Harbour. Two million NSW people go boating each year, half a million people in NSW have a boating licence, and there are prolific numbers of unregistered kayaks, canoes and sailing craft also in the mix.

In relation to Sydney Harbour in particular, the most significant constraint to the development of maritime infrastructure is the complexity of the planning system. This has limited new development and is a considerable obstacle to the necessary renewal and repair of existing facilities in Sydney Harbour. As a clear indication of the importance of this issue, please see **attached a listing of our members** who operate their businesses on Sydney Harbour. While most acute on Sydney Harbour, these complexities also apply across NSW.

The deemed SEPP, the *Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005* (SREP), introduced several improvements when compared with the previous instruments, however confusion over interpretation, lack of alignment with local environmental planning instruments and the complexities introduced through the visual assessment process, have become an impediment to the modernisation of the Harbour. This is further exacerbated by the lack of substantive review or reform since 2005. All these factors have led to lack of progress, as well as the loss of several sites to land-uses with a more favourable treatment under the planning system. The industry attributes this to onerous conditions in the SREP; and the associated *Sydney Harbour Foreshores and Waterways Area Development Control Plan (DCP)*.

For many years, most recently in our document ***A new approach to boating on Sydney Harbour***, the BIA has highlighted the impact of planning constraints, being:

- The lack of innovation and improvement in boating infrastructure; harbour access and tourism opportunities; and
- The dominance of water-based moorings for boat storage, with the inefficiencies of space, poor administration, and issues for safety and accessibility which this creates;
- The cost of planning approval often being greater than the cost of the infrastructure.

The large number of recreational and light commercial vessels need access points, storage, servicing, repair and often provisioning. Key outcomes of planning reform should include:

- After discussion with industry, ensuring that there are sufficient suitable land/water interfaces to accommodate boating activities on Sydney Harbour.
- Ensuring that these suitable sites can be developed without conflicts in the language in the planning instruments, particularly in 'Aims', 'Zoning Objectives', 'Matters for Consideration', 'Planning Principles' and that there is consistency in decision-making across the Harbour.
- Broadening the range of uses and activities in relation to the maintenance of existing maritime structures for which exempt or complying provisions may be available. In particular, simpler processes for low impact activities such as advertising at sites; and to allow for mobile and temporary uses so that the SEPP (Exempt and Complying) can be applied to these uses and activities.
- Broadening the scope of secondary land uses that are ancillary to commercial marina uses, for example food and beverage services, hire of boats, so that marinas can

operate as access points to the harbour for the public, whether or not they have a private boat stored there.

- In relation to the zoning, adoption of a zoning regime that generally matches the Standard Instrument LEP, merit-based rather than prescriptive approach, a review of Greenfield sites to determine inconsistencies and better planning for the long term, which must in part be achieved through a different decision-making model
- Removing the Foreshores and Waterways Development Advisory Committee due to duplication in its activities, and its scope for subjective and unaccountable decisions or influences.
- Allowing the subdivision of land under the control of Roads and Maritime Services (RMS), to allow for long term leases, and for sale of reclaimed which is not suitable for public foreshore access.
- Streamlining the consent role to eliminate the need for multiple approvals; and simplifying the proof of existing use rights, which has become an administrative nightmare.

Several of these have been addressed in the SEPP EoIE and the BIA welcomes the positive steps taken by the Government.

The BIA supports the stated purpose of the SEPP EoIE to balance the protection and enhancement of the natural environment with the need for economic growth, employment opportunities and investment in infrastructure to support social and community wellbeing.

The BIA does however caution that maritime infrastructure is not usually highest and best use in waterfront locations in such a sought-after harbour. Boating infrastructure often requires a specific set of land and water characteristics in a potential site for it to be functional as a location for boating facilities, for example sufficient water depth, appropriate wind and wave climate for safe navigation and road access for vehicles. Residential development on the other hand has more flexibility in terms of site utility. This creates a strong market bias which can result in the sterilisation of rare boating infrastructure sites by residential development. The risk is that the boating sector will be unwittingly constrained from any growth capacity if land use zoning intervention fails to recognise the specific needs of commercial and recreational water users.

Overall challenge

The challenge is to balance everyone's desire for the protection of the natural beauty of the Harbour with provision of the infrastructure that allows people to get out to enjoy it. There's a need to balance the interests of those lucky enough to live on the foreshore with those who want to be able to launch or store a boat. There's a demand for both private and public facilities, to be considered in a fair way without letting the politics of envy get in the way. And for decisions to be made on sound environmental and safety grounds, rather than in response to the loudest voices.

Detailed comments

While the SEPP EoIE has the potential to improve the status quo, below are some issues which need further consideration.

Vision, aims, objectives and planning principles

Since 2005, virtually all applications for consent have resulted in lengthy legal disputes with the cost of development skyrocketing for the maritime sector in Sydney Harbour and less so in other NSW waterways. A key issue that has arisen is the differing approaches and interpretations of the vision, aims, objectives and planning principles by consent authorities, and even in the Land and Environment Court. For example, some Councils have refused applications that have met all except one of the Aims in Clause 2 of the SREP.

The BIA welcomes the proposed change to the Aims in relation to the current SREP Aim at 1(d) to clarify that the 'working harbour' includes a range of recreational, transport, tourism and commercial uses and this needs to be reflected in all the document.

In order to ensure that the proposed changes are effective in minimising the undesirable impacts, the legislation needs to more clearly define how the overall vision can be achieved without meeting each aim prescriptively. Additionally, the concept of public assets also needs to be better defined.

For example, while generally the community understands the benefits of roads and even begrudgingly accepts private operators and tolls, there is a disconnect in the mind of the community that boating infrastructure including marinas provide access to the public asset that is the waterway. While the operators and proponents derive a profit, they provide a financial return to the taxpayer as well as access for those who do not have direct access to waterways – in other words to over 99% of the population. This needs to be made clearer in the resulting instrument.

Examples of the need to be clear include the following from the SEPP EoIE:

- Part 1 at page 10; *The heads of consideration will seek to protect and maintain: Recreational scenic and environmental amenity.* How will this be clarified to demonstrate how boating infrastructure is key to recreational amenity?

The Executive Summary raises several key points at its point 5 on page 5 and the BIA notes the need to do the following in relation to the above comments:

- Ensuring single aims do not outweigh the total vision
- Broadening the public good to explain / describe the role that maritime infrastructure plays in Sydney Harbour as the showpiece it is
- More clearly defining the private good for example in relation to businesses providing a public good versus private residences

The Ministerial Direction to guide councils when preparing LEP is seen as a key tool for ensuring an improved land-water interface and the Aims of the new SEPP can do so by ensuring balance and integrating other desirable outcomes such as those included in the NSW Government's Sydney Harbour Boat Storage Strategy.

Also within the discussion on planning principles, reducing complexity and simplifying processes, there is a need to review the onerous requirements required to prove evidence of **existing use**. The BIA recommends a meeting or workshop with industry and planning

specialists to determine how the process can be simplified while maintaining the protections required.

Definitions and development

Several definitions need to be revised and additionally the implications on development arising from definitions is important. Some of these definitions are based on older technology, past environmental practices, or insufficient knowledge about the type of development leading to blanket bans.

The BIA recommends a separate workshop to include planning, environment and industry representatives to review the all the definitions before they are repealed, transferred and finalised. Importantly it is essential to further consider the type of development they describe and whether the development is correctly prohibited.

Examples of why this is needed include the following:

- Definitions such as **marinas and slipways** are recognised but as noted below under zoning, it is not the definition but the lack of alignment in uses that is the issue. Prior to repealing it is important to resolve this issue or if needed revise the definition to more clearly reflect the development type in any zone
- **Single moorings**: moorings are limited to single apparatus (the attachment to the seabed) but the definition does not clarify that the attachment creates the impact environmentally (block impact on seagrass vs environmentally 'friendly' moorings) not the boat which is attached. Moreover, allowing only single boats on each apparatus does not allow for innovation in storage such as those that permit more than one vessel to be attached to a single mooring apparatus. This needs to be explored further prior to drafting and a definition should account for innovations and better use of water space in particular at commercial sites.
- **Boatlifts**: it is unclear why these were initially blanket banned in the Harbour and other locations. It is assumed that there may have been concerns about overshadowing and visual impact. This has never been explored in depth and it is incongruous with practices around Australia and the rest of the world jurisdictions, which allow the use as well as innovations in design which have occurred in the past 20 years. Benefits include less need for antifouling, easier berthing and safer access to the boat for smaller boats in particular as the lift keeps the boat at the right height.

We recommend that passive boat lifts be permitted in mooring pens provided that

- a. The boat lift is wholly within the approved mooring pen
- b. The height of the floating boat lift does not exceed 400mm above sea level thereby being of minimal visual impact
- c. The boat lift does not include any crane or winch or mechanical device but is a passive float onto which a vessel is driven for passive storage
- d. The passive boat lift is of neutral or recessive color, generally grey or similar to merge into the visual context of a mooring pen

The definition of Boat Lift in the SREP 2005 means a device used for lifting or steering a vessel out of the water, but does not include such a device if it forms part of a boat repair facility or commercial marina. In 2005 floating boat lifts did not exist. However davits and travel-lifts, boat hoists and boat cranes did exist. Each of these lifting apparatus are active boat lifts and incorporate a mechanical device such as

ropes and pulleys, manually operated wire winch, electric powered wire winch, boat slings with electric cable winch or powered hydraulic pump lifts. The boat lifts that existed in 2005 were active lifting apparatus.

A floating boat lift is not an active lifting apparatus but a passive floating ramp. There are no moving parts and no cables or winches or hydraulic pumps. So it may be differentiated from other boat lifting devices.

Neither does a floating boat lift or passive floating ramp STEER a boat out of the water. The boat's propulsion system and the steering system drives and steers the boat onto the floating ramp. The boat's keel is aligned with the channel in the float and when successfully located, the channel secures the vessel upright for storage.

It is suggested that this type of development and the associated definition need to be revised and the prohibition removed to align NSW with the rest of the world. For reference see <https://dockpro.com.au/faqs/boat-lift/>

- **Designated development:** while the industry understands the need to undertake a vigorous environmental assessment for development, there is a need to review the inclusion of marina developments (excluding Greenfield development) as designated development in planning instruments and legislation. The inclusion of marinas and boating facilities pre-dates the Protection of the Environment Operations Act; predates the industry controls and standards for "clean marinas"; and assumes that all related development is in a category similar to extractive industries, pig-farming and the like. The drafting of the new SEPP provides an opportunity to describe the type of development more clearly and to consider how this can be updated in the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and Regulations

[Sydney Harbour Foreshores and Waterways Area Development Control Plan \(DCP\)](#)

Part D of the DCP in relation to the visual assessment of marinas has proven to be the issue that has had the largest impact on inhibiting development. While there is a recognised need to consider the level of visual amenity, there needs to be less prescriptive requirements. The BIA recognises that the new SEPP will seek to update numerous issues, however as an example we caution against changes that highlight reductions in overshadowing without information and discussion specifying how that will impact on berths. At the broadest interpretation, every new proposed berth could be seen to concentrate overshadowing without considering whether boats are already present, or the type of seabed being affected. Moreover, development and the related definition that is currently prohibited, such as boat lifts, needs to be reviewed in light of the proposed update.

It is our recommendation that industry planning specialists work with the Government to progress the revised visual assessment guidelines to ensure that they do not continue to be the simplest instrument by which development is stymied. It is also relevant that this process offers an opportunity to work with Government in term of proposed changes such as those discussed in this section.

Parking is another issue that is included in the DCP and as with visual assessment, the industry believes that modern approaches to parking need to be considered. The broad recommendations in the marina standard for parking ratios are under review, and yet are treated as a bare minimum in many sites. We encourage public transport and point-to-point transport throughout all forms of public activity, but block maritime development if it can't identify large parking areas at expensive waterfront adjacent land.

Repairs and maintenance and zoning

Based on 12 years practical experience of hundreds of members, the assessment and consent process requires streamlining, and the zones require consolidation and simplification. The BIA recommends that zone objectives should be amended to be practical and consistent with permitted activities for zone.

The BIA supports preservation of foreshore and waterway areas in need of preservation. Many sites are unsuitable for development owing to features such as public intertidal access, remnant sandstone cliffs, rocks and caves, angophora trees, seagrass beds, navigation impact, preservation of views from public sites, visual impacts from the waterway, sandy beaches accessible to the public.

However, there are many sites that are appropriate for development and redevelopment for marinas and these should be assessed on merit assessment case by case.

Repairs and maintenance

While recognising the positive changes made in 2013 through the SEPP (Exempt and Complying), we recommend replacement or repair of approved pilings through a Review of Environmental Factors without the need for a Development Consent (DA) or Complying Development Certificate (CDC).

To streamline the planning process and to improve safety on the water, piles which are shown to be part of a lawful structure should be permitted to be replaced or repaired without need of a DA or Complying Development Certificate. The exempt and complying development regulatory changes have been unsuccessful because:

- The cost of achieving development consent to replace or repair a pile exceeds the cost of the work, i.e. removing degraded pile and driving a new pile
- There is no saving in a CDC over a DA to replace or repair a pile
- CDC is only available in those zones where the pile does not rely on existing use (only for 1 in 9 zones can a CDC be utilised)

It is recommended that replacing piles and repairing piles be made exempt development if:

- Replaced like for like, site for site
- The pile being replaced or repaired is shown to have been lawfully approved
- A Review of Environmental Factors for the work methodology is approved by RMS

Zoning

One of the key issues that was raised by the BIA previously was that there is a need to match the zoning of the water and the adjacent land. As noted in the SEPP EoIE at page 33, the three key functions of the *current* SREP include:

1. establishing a set of planning principles to be used by councils for the preparation of planning instruments across the whole of the Sydney Harbour Catchment
2. zoning the waterways into nine different zones to provide detailed land use and planning controls that reflect the unique environmental characteristics and wide variety of land uses of the harbour and its tributaries

This was never clearly achieved and there are several examples where land zoning, aims and objectives adjacent to the SREP zoning for existing and even proposed sites conflict.

This above all result in difficulties for consent authorities (overwhelmingly Councils) who may then err on the side of a land instrument (LEPs). Examples include where a marina is permitted in the Waterway Zone but not on the adjacent land under the LEP, such as in the City of Canada Bay LEP.

The comments in the SEPP EoIE at page 35 note in relation to better aligning that one of the points to improving protections for Sydney Harbour is to remove inconsistencies in the current instrument regarding boat storage facilities. The BIA recommends a mapping study to identify these conflicts and to resolve them in collaboration with Council and industry. This will require:

- Mapping study to identify the conflicts; this can be delivered in a short period as a large part of the data exists but there needs to be a full digital overlay of the current and proposed waterway zones and permitted uses alongside the current LEP zones and permitted uses
- Work with Councils to more clearly align the LEPs with the SEPP (Environment)

In other instances, stakeholders, many of them private landholders, could not understand why they are surrounded by on-water structures such as boatsheds, skids and private slipways, for example in Five Dock Bay or Vaucluse, but these are now no longer permitted. Some of this was based for example on the former RMS policy (rescinded circa 2007-8) that private structures should be shared and so no new structures were allowed in selected bays.

Five specific comments in relation to the proposed new Zoning alignment

1. We advise against the proposal to align W1 Maritime Waters with W3 Working Waterways, Standard Instrument – Principal LEP

This does not seem reasonable as:

- It is contradicted by reality
 - There are many private marinas (and commercial marinas) in W1 Maritime Waters and these would probably be prohibited in W3 Working Waterways, which will rely on existing use rights. This would result in no expansion or re-development
 - There are virtually no boat building and repair facilities remaining in W1 and there are minimal wharf or boating facilities remaining in W1; W1 would not reflect reality or future intensification of residential development in adjoining inner Sydney
2. We advise against the proposal to align W5 Water Recreation with W2 Recreational Waterways, Standard Instrument – Principal LEP

Similar to the previous recommendation it is not reasonable because:

- The permitted activities in W2 are “Kiosks; Marinas”; this is imprecise and does not differentiate between commercial marinas, private marinas, mooring pens and even single jetty, ramp and pontoon adjoining a private residence
- The absence of specificity is a backward step; it leaves open opportunities for planning decisions being made through internal policies which would not be transparent or appealable

- Ambiguous permitted activity in a planning instrument promotes litigation and planning by case law

As an alternative proposal, we recommend:

3. The working port areas which are presently W1 Maritime waters be aligned with Zone W3 Working Waterways under Standard Instrument – Principal LEP Zone

And in relation to Waterway areas

4. W1 and Zone W5 and Zone W6 be combined and rezoned as Zone W6 Scenic Waters Active Use

This would permit with consent the following commercial facilities:

- Boat repair facilities
- Commercial marinas
- Charter and tourism facilities

This would permit with consent the following private facilities

- Private landing facilities
- Mooring pens
- Private marinas

This would permit with consent the following public activities

- Boat launching ramps
- Recreational or club facilities
- Public water transport facilities

This would rationalise zoning, correct many inconsistencies, resolve incompatibilities and plan for responsible development consistent with future public, commercial and private needs.

Examples include:

W6 Scenic Waters Active Use permits Commercial Marinas; permits Private Marinas; permits Mooring Pens; and permits Private Landing Facilities (jetty, ramp and pontoon). This should be the default or consolidated zoning for W1 and W5.

The two proposed alignments suggested in the EIE are not workable, will promote uncertainty and litigation and controversy, are inconsistent with reality, are incompatible with current and future trend away from a “big ship” harbour to a domestic and residential harbour. However the alternative proposal will satisfy the above criteria.

5. That Zone W6 Objectives be amended as shown below in italics to be compatible with permitted activities

Zone No W6 Scenic Waters: Active Use

The objectives of this zone are as follows:

- (a) to allow a range of public and *commercial and* private water-dependent development ~~DELETE~~ *close to shore only* where it can be demonstrated that such development minimises alienation of waters in this zone from public use, **but may be**

mitigated by increasing public access and public amenity, and is not constrained by shallow water depth, navigational conflicts or severe wave action,

(b) *to minimise the number and extent of structures over waters in this zone through mechanisms such as the sharing of structures between adjoining waterfront property owners*, **DELETE BECAUSE RMS NO LONGER REQUIRES SHARING**

(c) to ensure remnant natural features, aquatic habitat (including wetlands) and public access along the intertidal zone **where such access is available**, are not damaged **delete or impaired in any way by development**,

(d) to ~~Delete~~ *minimise* **mitigate** any adverse effect on views to and from waters in this zone and on the scenic values of the locality as a result of the size of vessels capable of being accommodated within the development **by increasing public access and public amenity**

The outcome after amendment would be:

Zone No W6 Scenic Waters: Active Use

The objectives of this zone are as follows:

- (a) to allow a range of public and commercial and private water-dependent development where it can be demonstrated that such development minimises alienation of waters in this zone from public use, but which may be mitigated by increasing public access and public benefit, and is not constrained by shallow water depth, navigational conflicts or severe wave action,
- (b) to ensure remnant natural features, aquatic habitat (including wetlands) and public access along the intertidal zone where such access is available, are not damaged,
- (c) to mitigate any adverse effect on views to and from waters in this zone and on the scenic values of the locality as a result of the size of vessels capable of being accommodated within the development by increasing public access and public benefit.

BIA Member Businesses operating on or around Sydney Harbour

<u>Company</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Type</u>
Davis Marina	Balgowlah	Marina , Slip and Moorings
Manly Boat Shed	Balgowlah	Marina , Slip and Moorings
Sailor Marine Engineering	Balgowlah	Mechanical Repairs
Clontarf Marine	Clontarf	Marina , Slip and Moorings
D'albora Marine - The Spit	The Spit	Marina , Slip and Moorings
Ryan Short Marine	The Spit	Slip and Mechanical repairs
Sydney Harbour Kayaks	The Spit	Kayak Hire
Mosman Bay Marina	Mosman	Marina , Slip and Moorings
Sydney Harbour Slipways	Kirribilli	Slip and Mechanical repairs
Point Piper Marine	Point Piper	Marina and Moorings
Chapman Yacht Management	Point Piper	Mechanical Repairs and detailing
Premier Marine	Rose Bay	Boat sales
Rose Bay Marine	Rose Bay	Marina and Moorings
Double Bay Marine	Double Bay	marina, slip and moorings
Cruising Yacht Club of Australia	Rushcutters Bay	Marina and Moorings
Eastsail	Rushcutters Bay	Yacht Hire
D'Albora Marina	Rushcutters Bay	Marina and Moorings
Sturrocks Ship Chandlers	Rushcutters Bay	Ship Chandlers
Rmarine Sydney	Rushcutters Bay	Boat Sales
White Bay 6 Marine Park	White Bay	Slip, mechanical repairs and boat storage
Sydney City Marine	Rozelle	Slip, mechanical repairs and boat storage
Sydney Boat House	Rozelle	Slip, mechanical repairs and boat storage
Standen Marine	Pymont	Boat sales
Cockatoo Boat Storage	Cockatoo Island	Slip, mechanical repairs and boat storage
Cockatoo Marine	Cockatoo Island	Mechanical Repairs
Woolwich Marina	Hunters Hill	Slip and mechanical repairs
Balmain Marine Centre	Balmain	marina, slip and moorings
Mirvac Birkenhead Point Marina	Birkenhead Point	Marina and Moorings
Gladesville Bridge Marina	Gladesville	marina, slip and moorings
Superior Marine Services	Gladesville	mechanical repairs
Abbotsford Point Boat Shed	Abbotsford	slip and mechanical repairs
D'albora Marina - Cabarita	Cabarita	Marina and Moorings
Q7 Marine	Cabarita	Boat sales
Noakes Boat and Shipyards	McMahons Point	slip, moorings and mechanical repair
Any Boat	Lavender Bay	Commercial Vessel operator
Captain Cook Cruises	Circular Quay	Commercial Vessel operator
Sydney Heritage Fleet	Prymont	Commercial Vessel operator
Australian Cruise Ship	Prymont	Commercial Vessel operator
Quayside Charters	Prymont	Commercial Vessel operator
Australian Superyachts	Jones Bay	Commercial Vessel operator
Sydney Princess Cruises	Blackwattle Bay	Commercial Vessel operator
Sea Sydney Harbour Pty Ltd	Blackwattle Bay	Commercial Vessel operator
Blackwattle Bay Marine	Blackwattle Bay	Marina and Moorings

Chapman Marine Group	Rozelle	Boat sales
SACS Marine Australia	Rozelle	Boat sales
Coast Harbour Cruises	Rozelle	Commercial Vessel operator
5 star motor cruisers	Rozelle	Commercial Vessel operator
Northwind Marine	Balmain	mechanical repair
x-yachts Australia	Cabarita	Boat sales
33 South Marine Electyronics	Woolwich	mechanical repairs
Boatworks Australia	Woolwich	Boat sales
Harbour Staff	Rushcutters Bay	staffing, kayak hire, marina operations
Northbridge Marina	Northbridge	marina, slip and moorings
Sailors Bay Boatshed	Sailors Bay	marina, slip and moorings