

M4 EAST EIS SUBMISSION

General Statement

Whilst we are not against projects of this type in general we have to raise our strenuous opposition due to number of serious concerns with the “preferred option”.

There is no clear business case for this proposal. Likewise there is no clear coordinated plan as to how this proposal integrates with the Parramatta Rd corridor. Contracts have been signed prior to the release and consideration of the EIS. There is also no clear direction as to what happens to the “grey spaces” in this proposal. Hence, the process is extremely flawed and needs to be addressed.

The transferring of control of the project to a private entity only confirms that the lack of transparency is deliberate and needs to be reversed.

We are of the firm view that the Haberfield Heritage Conservation Area (HHCA) should not have a “major impact” as indicated in the EIS. The HHCA should be left intact due to its significant heritage value as identified by the EIS. There are clear options to achieve this without significant alterations.

The priorities identified by the “preferred option” are disproportionate. The HHCA is a significant heritage item and its houses should be respected above Ashfield Park or Yasmar, as they are an intrinsic part of the heritage value in its totality and not simply singular items. Ashfield Park and /or Yasmar would only be partially affected with the original or other options available.

Haberfield is clearly the most impacted suburb by this proposal and this is totally incongruous with the heritage value of the suburb. Residents have abided by a very strict building code for decades only now to find that this is being totally ignored in this proposal.

Wattle St and Walker Ave will be decimated by this proposal as the EIS confirms. Walker Ave unlike Wattle St and Parramatta Rd has never been a major thoroughfare and as such should be left intact. The expectations of residents who live in quiet streets as opposed to

major roads are clearly different. This is not respected by this proposal and needs to be addressed.

Other options are clearly available that do not impact on the HHCA, specifically the Bunning's site, Brescia site and multiple areas on Parramatta road.

Adverse impacts on a park, singular non residential buildings and industrial areas on Parramatta Rd should be prioritised over the use of residential areas as they are shared areas which if partially affected would dilute the impact on specific individuals whose houses, streets and suburbs are currently proposed to be affected.

In particular, the Parramatta road corridor should be used instead of ANY encroachment into residential areas as it is generally underused by commerce and industry. There are multiple empty lots currently not in use in close proximity to the current design that could be used for multiple purposes instead of levelling Federation houses and very mature trees in the HHCA for a works area which is simply an abhorrent proposal.

Specific Issues

HHCA

Residents in the HHCA have abided by a very strict development code over many years. This code has clearly served to enhance the Heritage value of the suburb. It has additionally contributed to increasing the actual dollar value of homes in the suburb. Like many we have significantly developed our house abiding by the code, which is now, being totally ignored by the State Government and West Connex,

The code imposes a number of restrictions on developments. You cannot change your streetscape but only return you house to its original design where possible. You cannot build another story due to its visual impact on the amenity of others in the HHCA. Any development must be Federation as identified by the code.

To acquire house in the HHCA for this project shows clear contempt for the preservation of Heritage and culture in general as there are multiple options available to respect the heritage value of Haberfield.

The EIS clearly identifies the impact on the HHCA to be “major adverse” at table 19.26. It clearly sets out significant impacts to the “legibility of the original layout”, visual impacts, fragmentation of the suburb, ventilation outlets and other works that are not sympathetic to the current area, destruction of houses and trees that “disturb the rhythm” of federation house in Walker Ave amongst other major issues.

The mitigation measures proposed are simply unacceptable and achieve nothing of merit.

At NAH27 (pg. 19-49) there is no detail on ventilation design whatsoever. No diagrams, no detail on height or orientation, but this is then deemed to be “somewhat effective”. How can one form a view with no detail? A ventilation outlet of 20 metres in height clearly would have a different impact to one of 40 metres and as such renders the mitigation strategy as absurd and meaningless. Any buildings within or that impact the HHCA must apply with the current HHCA code.

At NAH28 the planting strategies are deemed to be “moderately effectively”, The most effective strategy would be not to take the trees from the streets such as Walker Ave as they would provide an immediate barrier to any future works. The time for trees to grow to their current heights would be decades and hence unacceptable.

At NAH29 the mitigation to the levelling of Federation houses in the HHCA is “photographic archival recording of the affected areas” and is deemed to be “least effective” in reconstructing streetscapes. It is therefore not possible to replace original federation houses as the EIS clearly sets out and as such they should be left intact or at a minimum returned to parkland.

It is clearly summed up unequivocally in the EIS on page vii of part H Non- Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment that “Although localised in the section of the HHCA around Wattle, Northcote, Wolseley streets, the impact of the proposal on the heritage significance of the Haberfield HCA and individual heritage items within it would be significant and unable to be effectively mitigated.”

Given that the EIS clearly outlines an unacceptable impact on the HHCA with no effective mitigation another solution that respects the HHCA in its entirety must be found.

Alternative Routes

There are a number of other routes that would reduce the impact on the HHCA whilst allowing the project to proceed. Options P1, P2 and P3 would have a significantly less impact as a whole on the HHCA and its residents. This would help preserve the HHCA into the future which ensures its historical significance survives.

Tunnel outlets at Taverners Hill and at Annandale just prior to the Anzac Bridge would provide a more effective solution as a whole.

It is also possible to relocate the ventilation outlets and working areas outside the HHCA and hence lessen the 'major adverse impact' identified by the EIS. Haberfield should definitely wear the total burden of pollution, noise and traffic.

As such, we strongly suggest an alternative or amended route.

Ventilation Outlets

The lack of detail on design of the ventilation outlets is unacceptable. Without this detail one cannot objectively critique the proposal. As such these outlets should not have any visual impact on existing streetscapes.

Outlets should also be filtered in line with the world's best science and not whatever practice is cherry picked from around the world and passed off as "world's best practice."

These facilities should be placed away from schools and like amenities and be designed to be sympathetic to the local environment. The EIS clearly sets out at page vii of part H that this is not part of this proposal and hence needs to be addressed.

There are a number of other options available to do this.

Grey Spaces

It is simply unacceptable that there is no detail on what will happen to the “grey spaces” in this proposal. As a resident of Walker Ave I have been unable to obtain a definitive answer as to what will happen to the grey space in my street after the works have been completed.

If the houses acquired are demolished any heritage value will have been destroyed and will be irreplaceable. Whilst being strongly of the view that these houses should not be acquired if they are and destroyed then the grey space should be returned to parkland, as any other use will simply only further destroy the heritage value of the area.

Walker Ave Impact

The impact on the street in which we reside is already real. Property values in our street have already been significantly affected by this proposal. Two properties in our street were unable to attract a bid at auction in recent months, in what has been the hottest property market on record. Number 17 walker was subsequently sold for \$1 100 000 which when compared to similar properties in adjacent streets shows a loss in the order of 20%.

If this project goes ahead in its current form then the residents of our street will be subject to noise, dust, traffic, visual and environmental pollution and the like for years to come. All of this will be of no real benefit and will likely result in a real decrease in property values and subsequent health concerns created by the stress of living with this proposal.

The EIS clearly gives no effective mitigation strategies to address this. As such, we are of the unequivocal view that the works area “grey space “ on Walker Ave be relocated or at least be guaranteed to be returned to green space on completion of the project.

As our street currently experiences rat running we also require that the entry from Parramatta road be permanently closed and that Haberfield as a whole is protected from the likewise from rat running to avoid tolls and congestion.

Likewise we require that any ventilation/utilities be designed so as not to visually or environmentally impact on our lives. Only by doing this will we have any confidence in reducing the significant impact that has been put upon us.

The noise from the proposed works will have a significant on our lives. As an Airline Pilot employed by Qantas Airways I am regularly required to obtain rest prior to and after work in daylight hours. The proposed works and associated noise will make it basically impossible for myself to obtain proper rest prior to any flying duties. This means that it is highly likely I will not be fit for work as required by the relevant legislation. I will if required take appropriate action to address this if required.

Therefore the use of Walker Avenue for heavy vehicles is completely unacceptable.

SUMMARY

The EIS confirms a number of serious concerns that must be addressed,

- Ensure transparency of the whole process. Release the business case and keep the project open to public scrutiny.
- Respect the HHCA and the residents who have abided by its code. Modify or use other options to preserve the HHCA.
- Give clarity to what will happen to the “grey spaces”. Ensure they are returned to green spaces.
- Ensure Ventilation outlets are filtered, located away from schools and the like and are sympathetic in height and design to the local amenity.
- Ensure that suburbs such as Haberfield are protected from rat running that will occur. Close off entries from Parramatta road.
- Ensure that noise mitigation is extremely effective and that heavy vehicles are not on residential streets.
- If the mitigation measures identified in the EIS are not effective then find solutions that are.
- Ensure that streets like Walker Avenue are not disproportionately affected by adverse outcomes.

This process has taken significant amount of our time to address and has already had significant adverse impact on our lives. The stress and financial disadvantage this process has placed upon us is very real and as such we implore to consider this submission, as the impact of this project on us will continue for some time to come.

Yours sincerely,

Albertina Hill

Bradley Hodson