

Submission
SSD-5145-Mod-5

I am writing mainly in relation to 7.1.2, impact Assessment

This section deals with the proposed selection of the route named Route 1, Wakefield Rd / Rhondda Rd / Palmers Rd.

This route is very well known to me, as a resident of Rhondda Rd.

I object to the selection of this route for the following reasons:

- I feel it is misleading to refer to Rhondda Rd without mentioning that it is actually the motorway. Even though it is a council road, in a residential area, it is signposted as MWY at the junction with Railway St, Teralba. This is known to road users, and already brings about high density of traffic using Rhondda Road up to Palmers Rd.
- MWY - Rhondda Road - already carries heavy industrial traffic and is in constant use by utilities, as well as residential traffic, making a very mixed load of traffic usage.
- It may be expected that traffic density over the Wakefield/Rhondda Rd area will increase in coming years from at least three sources:
 1. The construction of the BlackRock motor sport project, announced in 2024, will bring new levels of traffic on Rhondda Rd, to an extent as yet unknown.
 2. Concrush has applied to increase its number of heavy traffic movements day and night, and the outcome of this application is not yet known.
 3. The State government plan to increase the population of Teralba, as part of addressing the housing crisis, is set to bring higher levels of traffic into Teralba, and using Rhondda Rd, than at any earlier time. The impact of this plan cannot be gauged at this time, but it can be expected to have a major impact.

The above three points are projects that are due to start in the near future.

The selection of Option 1 by Centennial Coal is based on **present** use of the route. But this will soon change in ways that cannot be currently estimated. For a plan moving coal to Eraring Power station to be approved, which aims to be in operation until 2045 (2.1), the increased **future** traffic on this already busy route must be considered, in this period of rapid climate change.

The plan states that it will add 112 heavy traffic movements per day from Wakefield (7.1.5) How this volume of heavy traffic can be added to Route 1 without major impacts of road safety is not addressed in the Report. Extra levels of traffic density and noise will inevitably rise from the above sources of sport and residential development. Together with the industrial truck movements already in place, this will produce a mixture of types of traffic that is not being considered in the current plan. I note that Noise Impact Assessments are based on studies dating back to 2014 (6.1.1). This too needs to be reassessed for current and future purposes.

It is important that the decision should be based not on past road usage, but on the future proposed development of the area and route, with the changes that this will soon bring.

I thus oppose the selection of Route 1 in SSD-51-Mod-5, and recommend that Centennial Coal look for a different route, one which may hopefully be more direct, and impact fewer road users and residents.