

From: Tarja Shephard
35 Lang Street
Croydon NSW 2132

Attention: Director – Infrastructure Projects
Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

22nd October 2015

Dear Sir or Madam

Re: Application No. SSI 6307 Submission in response to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the M4 East Motorway

As a landowner directly affected by the proposed construction of the M4 East motorway twin tunnels from Concord to Haberfield, I wish to make a submission in response to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

I have read the whole ten volumes of the EIS, and I attended consultations on the dates shown and kept detailed records of discussions from these consultations.

- Monday 13 July 2015 public consultations at Wests Ashfield Leagues Club
- Saturday 18 July 2015 public consultations at Club Concord
- Saturday 18 July 2015 resident meeting at Centenary Park Croydon
- Thursday 30 July door knocked by two WestConnex representatives
- Saturday 22 August 2015 resident meeting at Arnotts Reserve Homebush
- Wednesday 23 September 2015 Ashfield Council Meeting Ashfield Town Hall
- Tuesday 6 October 2015 resident meeting at Blair Park Croydon

I wish to object to the M4 East preferred design route in its current design under homes and in this regard I have raised objections with detailed reasons given in my submission.

My submission starts with this letter numbered page 1 and continues onto the following pages numbered from 2 to 20.

I have not made any political donations.

I have read the terms of the Privacy Statement on the website
www.planning.nsw.gov.au/privacy

Yours sincerely

Tarja Shephard

I object to the M4 East motorway preferred design route being approved underneath homes because Volume 1A Chapter 7 of the EIS describes the consultation process however I have concerns about the consultations:

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because the M4 East project was shrouded in secrecy with a lack of two-way consultation and there was a lack of resident input regarding the new preferred design route which left me and other residents in Croydon and Burwood in shock, and this was unacceptable.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route for the twin tunnels underneath homes being approved because whilst I initially supported the M4 East motorway tunnel project at the time when I was actually invited to comment on it at public consultations held during 2013 and 2014 and when the picture and information relayed to me and to the general public clearly showed that the tunnels would run underneath the existing Parramatta Road alignment, I do not support the M4 East project in its current preferred design to place these twin tunnels underneath fragile old federation homes in Croydon and Burwood and I question why the public was shown the preliminary concept design of the motorway route underneath Parramatta Road to comment on, then future consultations were suddenly cancelled and in the following year in June 2015 a new preferred design route was suddenly announced to place the twin tunnels south away from Parramatta Road and underneath our homes without any resident input on that new preferred design to place the tunnels underneath homes.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes in Croydon and Burwood being approved because to me it seems like the proposed motorway was planned and designed behind the scenes by a group of people who may not have considered how the new preferred route would affect the residents here, our feelings and our concerns for our old homes, and I feel as a landowner directly affected by this project, the manner in which we were informed of this major change via a brochure placed into our letterbox was unacceptable. There was no knock on the door, or any face-to-face contact with me or my family, nor with my neighbours, regarding the new preferred design route prior to the WestConnex public consultations held in July 2015.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because whilst I understand that the Government wished to accept a tender prior to approval so that the EIS could be written in a way to better reflect its content in regard to the preferred design route, I feel the acceptance of a tender comes across as unethical since residents could not have any input on the preferred design route before its announcement, and given that a tender has been accepted already this sends a message that, despite there being consultations held or that people are invited to write a submission in response to the EIS, the project with the preferred design route will most likely be approved regardless of what the public comments.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because a number of residents in my area told me and another Croydon resident who was with me that they had not received the community update brochure in their letterbox and did not know about the public consultations held in July 2015. I know this because I spoke with local residents together with the other Croydon resident and we handed to the Mayor of Burwood Council along with another Burwood Councillor present, a petition signed by over 400 residents objecting to the preferred design route of the twin tunnels underneath homes and asking for the route to be placed back to run underneath where Parramatta Road is now located as that was the route informed to us previously. Many of these residents who signed the petition verbally informed us they did not receive the community update brochure and also informed us they did not know the twin tunnels were planned for underneath homes stating they thought the tunnels were going underneath Parramatta Road.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because I understand the processes of public consultation having worked within many project teams to consult with the public, and I know that acting with transparency, honesty, openness, respect, trust, inclusiveness and ethically to provide information in a timely way are the values of the state government for its employees and associates when providing services, but I feel these consultations lacked transparency and I can only conclude that if there were so many secrets then it could only be an attempt to keep information from people. During WestConnex consultations I felt that questions were answered in a very broad and general way to reveal less rather than more. I even read on the internet that if people were informed everything about the motorway then it would probably never be built and this suggests that we were not provided with information in a timely manner. I object because I feel that open and complete consultation is always the only way to consult and conduct business and trying to hide things is unethical.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because when I initially asked why the route was moved to underneath homes I was given the answer that feedback was gathered from comments on the concept design, but that route was shown as being underneath Parramatta Road and not underneath homes and feedback from the public did not indicate that people wanted the tunnels underneath homes, so I believe that this feedback was from the NSW Government of their desire to save money by constructing these tunnels underneath our homes but with the disadvantage, as stated in the EIS in Volume 1A Table 4.2, that the tunnels are under homes and I object to the twin tunnels underneath our homes and underneath my home.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route under homes being approved because I felt the consultations were set up to inform innocent residents in the path of the motorway and twin tunnels what they will have to accept and to live with in the brave new world of motorways, with only bits and pieces of information released strategically at specific points throughout the project and I feel this is unacceptable and not a transparent way to consult.

I object to the M4 East preferred design for the motorway twin tunnels route underneath homes being approved because I note in the document entitled '*Environment Assessment Requirements*' it requires, I quote:

“During the preparation of the EIS, you must consult with the relevant State or Commonwealth Government authorities, service providers, community groups and affected landowners”

The document goes on to state:

“The EIS must describe the consultation process and the issues raised, and identify where the design of the project has been amended in response to these issues.”

I object as an affected landowner, to the M4 East preferred design route for the motorway twin tunnels underneath homes being approved because the '*Environment Assessment Requirements*' required affected landowners to be consulted with and Volume 1A of the EIS outlines the consultation process but I feel I was not given decent answers at consultations that satisfied me nor were my issues raised in the EIS, nor have I seen in the EIS “how the design of the project has been amended in response to these issues” and I raise these concerns and issues below.

I object as an affected landowner, to the M4 East preferred design route for the motorway twin tunnels underneath homes because Volume 1A of the EIS outlines the consultation process and I mentioned several times to different representatives during two different consultation sessions that I have massive steel beams and many other large beams in my roof and I fear cracking to my home should a huge tunnel be constructed underneath my house and I would question the resulting stability of those beams and my house afterwards even if those beams were designed by a structural engineer. I would have liked to have been given answers to fair questions so that I had enough information to feel satisfied that there is absolutely no risk whatsoever to our house with a large upstairs extension of heavy construction and beams and the safety of neighbouring properties within close proximity to my property with similar upstairs extensions. There is nothing in the EIS that suggests that our home will be safe from damage and I am not convinced it will be safe.

I object as an affected landowner, to the M4 East preferred design for the motorway twin tunnels route underneath homes being approved because Volume 1A of the EIS outlines the consultation process and I have concerns about risks of land subsidence, sink holes and other damages including cracking resulting to our home and around 500 other homes along the corridor in our local area should twin tunnels be constructed under our homes. Other than the EIS mentioning different types of cracking that may be expected, I have not seen supporting evidence to inform me how safe it would be to live above a tunnel and I was informed by a tunnel expert during consultations that tunnel collapse is a possibility.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route of twin tunnels placed underneath homes being approved because Volume 1A of the EIS outlines the consultation process and during consultations a tunnel expert revealed to me and my partner that tunnel disasters such as the Lane Cove collapse and the Brisbane tunnel claims could not be ruled out and that tunnel collapse is always a possibility. On the WestConnex website in a report entitled '*WestConnex M4 East Homebush Bay Drive to Parramatta Road and City West Link State Significant Infrastructure application report*' in section 5.8.2 under the heading of 'Potential impacts' the report lists tunnel collapse and subsidence as hazards and risks associated with the project both during construction and during operation. These are unacceptable risks and are risks to a lot of homes, 700 homes as mentioned in the EIS, especially since there is an alternate route for the twin tunnels underneath Parramatta Road and underneath the required setback areas on busy roads for new future developments, and away from resident's homes where the motorway will have the least impact on residents and their homes.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route of the twin tunnels underneath homes being approved because of the unknown effects of living above a tunnel and due to my knowledge of previous known tunnel disasters such as what happened at Lane Cove with the tunnel collapse and the resident's home units resulting in damages and partly falling inside the tunnel and residents were disadvantaged and the units were sold to another party after the disaster, and also my knowledge of the known claims of damages by property owners of homes located above the Brisbane tunnels, claims of subsidence and a huge sink hole and the disadvantages those residents are suffering. Residents in Sydney's inner west do not need these types of disasters or problems here. Volume 2E Appendix A page 7 of the EIS describes positives and negatives regarding the Brisbane tunnels however it fails to mention claims for the damages that occurred after construction of the tunnels underneath homes. I feel that the positives and negatives described are the views of the writer of the EIS.

I object as an affected landowner, to the M4 East preferred design for the motorway twin tunnels route underneath homes being approved because I have real concerns about the possibility of similar disasters such as the Lane Cove Tunnel collapse and also concerns of the claims of land subsidence and a sink hole above the Brisbane tunnel and I was informed by a tunnel expert and I read in media articles that the soil was different in those places to what it is here. I note that at the time of release of the EIS not all the geotechnical testing had been completed along the planned corridor as I saw cages set up along the corridor to conduct this testing so I question how can it be known what rock structure is underneath our streets and homes, how stable it is and at what depth the top of the Hawkesbury Sandstone actually is as the tunnels are supposedly being constructed mainly through the Hawkesbury Sandstone.

I object as an affected landowner, to the M4 East preferred design for the motorway twin tunnels route underneath homes being approved because I have read reports about the ground structure at the disaster locations mentioned above and the reports indicated the ground consisted of shale and I have conducted some research of my own which suggests that Ashfield Shale is the main rock structure in the inner west area of Sydney and ranges between 45 metres to 64 metres in depth then the Hawkesbury Sandstone is located below that. If this is the case then the twin tunnels would not be mainly through Hawkesbury Sandstone but through Ashfield Shale and this concerns me especially since I have not been shown or seen any bore hole results showing results of testing along the preferred route but the EIS does reveal that bore hole testing was carried out along where Parramatta Road is located.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because I have not seen in the EIS bore hole results along the preferred design route, I only saw a cross dimensional diagram of the rock structure shown in the EIS, showing the depths of different rock types, there was a diagram but no actual depths measured of each rock layer indicated on the diagram and written information in the EIS suggests the depths of each rock layer with the Ashfield Shale being between 5 and 10 metres deep then the Hawkesbury Sandstone being 290 metres deep. Volume 1B Chapter 16 Section 16.1.4 refers to the preliminary conceptual site model but no bore holes are shown from Burwood to Croydon and I would like to see actual evidence of the bore hole results and the depth to the Hawkesbury Sandstone.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because Volume 1A of the EIS mentions tunnel depths underneath different streets along the tunnel corridor. I note that these tunnel depths do not match with what the representatives informed me, and the EIS states the tunnel underneath our street as being 37 metres in depth, a representative informed me over the telephone it is 45 metres in depth, a tunnel expert informed me during consultations it will be 42 metres in depth and he even drew me a diagram on the back of a WestConnex brochure of how the tunnel will look with the depths and I still have that brochure, then two representatives who door knocked me told me errors had been made in the calculations of the tunnel depths and it is now 35 metres in depth under my home therefore I do not trust the information because it is now just indicated generally to be 35 metres in depth.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because as a landowner directly affected, I have real concerns about a hole the width of 12.5 metres and the width of three traffic lanes underneath our home, both tunnels which essentially are a duplication of Parramatta Road underground. One tunnel will be located underneath our whole entire property from one side boundary fence to the other side boundary fence, and from my front fence to the back boundary fence, my whole entire property, and as my home is also located within 50 metres from the other 12.5 metre wide tunnel it is a double whammy for me and for other residents along the tunnel route as our homes will be located so close to two huge tunnels of six lanes of traffic. Our homes will be at risk of double damages, double post construction noise and double post construction vibrations and I do not want our home or its occupants including my children or our relatives or visitors coming here put in danger of a huge tunnel underneath my home and underneath the whole of my property, and I do not want these people or my property put at risk of land subsidence or sink holes as has happened at other tunnel locations mentioned and I object to the tunnels under homes.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route under homes being approved because as a landowner directly affected by this project we have spent over 30 years restoring our old home and paying off a hefty mortgage to own an old character federation house on land in a lovely suburb with community spirit such as Croydon and now there is a proposal to place two three lane tunnels underneath properties in our suburb of old fragile homes with crumbling lime mortar and with shallow footings and to place our homes at risk of cracking, whether it is cosmetic or more severe cracking, is not fair. One property owner even has both of the planned tunnels underneath their very old cottage and property, a home which they have restored over the years.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because a representative informed residents at a resident meeting held at Centenary Park Croydon on 18th July 2015 that the tunnels will be built with a *'fit for purpose'* warranty. I have not seen in the EIS an explanation of what that means and I consider my home is built to a *'fit for purpose design for safe residential habitation and quiet occupation'* and I don't want our home or anyone here put at risk of suffering due to tunnels underneath homes.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because I have serious concerns about vibrations and blasting I have read about in the EIS should a tunnelling machine go underneath our home. I would not want the lime mortar to crumble away and leave the bricks loose and unstable on our home.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because the EIS suggests that cracking of 5mm to 15mm is considered as cosmetic damage and rectified by relining interior walls and by replacing sections of external brickwork but federation homes are difficult to repair and restore so why should residents be faced with the inconvenience of having to take time off work and sacrificing wages to supervise tradespeople to have damages to their already fragile homes repaired or even be faced with having to pay for these repairs themselves should they not be covered.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because exposing old homes to vibration, such as the vibration my partner and I were informed by a contractor of the project which would be underneath our old home for an estimated period of 21 days, I feel will damage our house to a state which will leave it beyond repair even if the EIS states that property condition surveys will be conducted and even if damages may be eligible for repairs and there is no guarantee they will be eligible for repair.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because if the evidence of damage is not apparent straight away after construction, and that as the evidence of damage may not become apparent for a few years as soil may continue to settle, or even up to 100 years after construction of the tunnel, and even though it has been stated that the tunnel contractor will cover damage, it was stated to us during consultations that damages would be covered *“only if it can be proven it was caused by the tunneling works”* and in a letter I received it states *“I may be eligible for repairs”*.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because my partner and I have already spent around 30 years restoring our fragile 100 year old federation house and we should not have to be faced with more possible problems requiring repairs with the uncertainty of whether our home will be subject to constant damage and cracking after the tunnels are constructed because of post construction vibration and noise with the earth vibrating due to the tunnels filled with enormous volumes of vehicles including trucks, as the EIS states they will remove 3,000 trucks from the road surface or due to land which may continue to settle or subside or form a hole.

I object as an affected landowner, to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because I have concerns about my property value should a tunnel be constructed underneath it and raised questions about this during consultations and I was informed an easement would be placed onto my title deeds but was not informed how this easement would affect my property value. Another resident who questioned this was informed not to mention the tunnel underneath to prospective purchasers.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route under homes being approved because at a resident meeting attended by WestConnex representatives at Centenary Park Croydon on the afternoon of 18th July 2015 I asked a tunnel expert at that meeting could the twin tunnels be constructed underneath where Parramatta Road is now actually located and that tunnel expert told the residents yes the twin tunnels could be constructed underneath where Parramatta Road is now located and he said he could build a tunnel anywhere.

I object as an affected landowner, to the M4 East preferred design for the motorway twin tunnels route underneath homes because a tunnel expert informed residents at a resident meeting at Arnotts Reserve Homebush on 22nd August 2015 that no-one wants a tunnel under their home and informed us that he would not want a tunnel under his home either so why are we expected to accept tunnels underneath our homes, and when the EIS states in Volume 1A in Table 4.2 under the heading of ‘Disadvantages’ tunnels underneath homes as being a disadvantage.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because Volume 2G of the EIS covers heritage and our old federation homes form an important part of Sydney's heritage and the early pioneering days of the inner west and form the feel of the suburbs that comprise the inner west. Even our local Councils do not like residents changing the appearance of their old homes when constructing new additions and prefer owners to preserve the heritage look and feel and to preserve the original features of these old homes, and I object to them being put at risk of tunnelling activities.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because the inner west areas of Burwood and Croydon mainly comprise of older style federation homes and these homes should be preserved and not destroyed. Many homes in this area are over 100 years old. Federation houses typically have very shallow footings, the bricks are now old and the lime mortar crumbles easily making these homes very fragile. For example, our old house stands in a street, amongst other fine federation houses, which was once the original dirt track used by early settlers to travel from one part of the suburb to another. Our house even still has the original slate roof and original features, and has been restored to a fine character home and I object to it being put at risk of damage because our house has already stood the test of time where it stands for 100 years but I fear its stability if a huge tunnel is constructed underneath it and underneath other old homes in this area of a similar age to our home.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because some residents, as we did, buy a home such as an old federation house as they prefer this style of house and the old world charm and I feel it is important to preserve these houses for future generations so that they are a reminder of how our suburbs came to be and what they are today rather than to put our homes at risk of being destroyed and to destroy our heritage, whether these homes are heritage listed or not. I feel it does not matter whether or not an old home is heritage listed or not because our homes are the same age as many heritage listed properties and just as fragile and deserve the same respect of preservation.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route under homes being approved because at consultations it was stated that a reason for the preferred design route under homes is because of the proposed second harbour crossing but the EIS mentions in Volume 1A on page 4-23 under option W2 connection for second harbour crossing and states that option W2 'was included in the concept design already' so it is no different in the concept design and the preferred design for the proposed second harbour crossing and if the two designs are compared this section looks the same.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route under homes being approved because I think that it is not impossible for an expert to design an alignment route to place the twin tunnels underneath Parramatta Road as that was where the twin tunnels were originally placed on the concept design and shown to the public, and if they could not be placed there at all then a picture such as the one shown to the public would not have been shown to us in the first instance. They could be placed deeper there and the route there straightened underneath commercial premises to provide a safe road for drivers to achieve a speed of 80kms per hour. Residents at consultations and at resident meetings have suggested this. The twin tunnels could be placed underneath the existing six lanes of Parramatta Road and also underneath the setback areas which will be required for all new future developments along Parramatta, the setbacks from the busy road to the fronts of the planned future developments.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route of the twin tunnels underneath homes because at consultations I asked about future development along Parramatta Road but it was never mentioned to me that a reason for the move of the tunnels to underneath homes was due to future planned development but in Volume 1A Chapter 4 in Table 4.2 of the EIS it states the reasons for the position of the tunnels south of Parramatta Road would also 'preserve the corridor for future development'. This information was not revealed to the public in a timely way prior to release of the EIS and our local MP did not even know that future development was a reason for the shift of the tunnels.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route under homes being approved because Chapter 4 Table 4.2 of the EIS states the tunnels are placed underneath homes because of planned development and mentions tunnels under Parramatta Road would 'restrict basements or footings of taller buildings' but with the requirement of the setbacks for all new future developments on busy roads, the tunnels could be accommodated underneath these setback areas and also underneath the existing six lanes on Parramatta Road where the tunnels will have the least impact on residents and would not restrict basements or footings of taller buildings. Further, information from Burwood Council indicates that the high rise developments planned for near Burwood Road and along Parramatta Road will most likely be built without basement parking anyway so the reasons in Volume 1A of the EIS for basements does not match with what Burwood Council has informed residents about these planned developments.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because Chapter 30 Section 28.4 page 28-3 of the EIS has a Table with the heading Risk Analysis Summary Human Health, which mentions potential impacts quoted as:

“property acquisition causing a negative short-term impact through stress on the health of individuals”

It states in regard to residual impacts:

“Even with the application of mitigation, short term adverse residual impacts are expected to remain.”

Volume 1A Chapter 11 page 11-6 and page 482 of the EIS suggests there could be psychological effects of tunnels underneath homes and residents tried to address these health concerns during consultations with a tunnel designer and a representative at a resident meeting at Arnotts Reserve Homebush on the 23rd August 2015, even before the EIS was released for comment, and the tunnel designer did agree stating that tunnels underneath homes may have psychological effects and this is the same tunnel designer who stated at the same meeting to residents that he would not want a tunnel under his own home either.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because Volume 1A Chapter 11 page 11-6 and page 482 of the EIS suggests there could be psychological effects of tunnels underneath homes the planned motorway is already causing health concerns such as stress, anxiety and psychological damage. It is causing stress, anxiety and psychological damage to my health, the health of my children and also to the health of my neighbour's and other residents I have known here for many years and I know they are feeling like this because they have told me and I have watched their psychological health decline since they found out about the proposed tunnels underneath their homes, and neighbours in my street were so stressed by the planned motorway and tunnels they even sold their home of over 30 years.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because Volume 1A Chapter 11 page 11-6 and page 482 of the EIS suggests psychological effects. Innocent residents do not need the anxiety and stress they are already suffering from the knowledge that they will have huge holes underneath their fragile homes built 100 years ago. It does not matter if the tunnel is 35 metres or so underground, it is a fact that psychological damage, anxiety and stress is already happening. A depth of 35 metres is not that deep anyway. Tunnels in other places such as Madrid are much deeper, 35 metres is only around the width of three house frontages of a typical inner west property.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because I personally have not slept one single whole night since I found out that a huge tunnel is proposed for underneath our home and underneath our whole entire property. Many residents who signed the petition against tunnels underneath their homes also stated the same thing to us as they signed the petition that they were worried and stressed and having trouble sleeping since they found out about the proposed tunnels under their homes and that they have been upset and crying as well as feeling enormous distress as I am too feeling distressed as well as my family members who are feeling like this including our children.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes because Volume 1A page 469 refers to post construction noise but I did not ever see any technical calculations in the EIS in regard to post construction noise calculations nor any calculations in relation to post construction vibrations that may or may not be expected from the proposed tunnels through the earth.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes because WestConnex representatives informed residents at a resident meeting held on 6 October 2015 at Blair Park Croydon that post construction noise and post construction vibration cannot be ruled out and that residents may have to live with vibrations such as glass vibrating and operational noise after construction. I do not have any vibrations such as rattling glass or any vibrations at all or noise in my home at present and I do not want this type of noise in my home in the future due to a motorway tunnel that I object to underneath homes. Volume 1A Chapter 10 page 469 of the EIS mentions that:

“there will be no noise heard from the tunnels post construction whilst in operation”

however, a WestConnex Fact Sheet dated September 2015 entitled ‘*M4 East Environmental Impact Statement – Tunnelling*’ states:

“Once the tunnel is complete, you are unlikely to be able to hear or feel any vibration from vehicles using the motorway”.

Information in the EIS conflicts with information in the Fact Sheet and also conflicts with what the WestConnex representatives told residents at the resident meeting at Blair Park Croydon on the 6th October 2015. Also residents above one tunnel may be affected by double post construction vibrations and double post construction noise as they are within 50 metres of the other tunnel and I object to the tunnels under homes as my property is located above one proposed tunnel and next to another proposed tunnel.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes because I do not trust the information about post construction vibrations and noise as it seems that by writing two different statements it may be a way for whoever will be responsible for the twin tunnels afterwards, to cover themselves should noise be heard or vibrations felt post construction and residents complain. This is unacceptable as residents are entitled to know the truth and to see the calculations that show without a doubt that if a tunnel is at a certain depth then there will be a definite guarantee in writing that no vibrations will be felt or noise heard post construction. Further, a tunnel expert informed me and my partner at Wests Ashfield Club on 13th July 2015 that there could be noise heard and vibrations felt from the tunnels post construction so am not convinced that there will be no noise heard or vibrations felt post construction. I object because it is unfair to inflict residents with motorway tunnels and possible post construction vibrations and noise underneath their bedrooms and lounge rooms and assume or expect that residents will be ok with it and I object to being put into this situation of having to accept this due to the effects being unknown and not guaranteed in writing.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because I believe that with the EIS predicted numbers of vehicles including very large numbers of trucks inside those tunnels, with predictions of 3,000 trucks removed from the road surface and into those tunnels daily as stated in the EIS, and especially when all the tunnels are joined together with a predicted 300,000 vehicles in this area, I am sure that I will hear some post construction noise and feel some post construction vibrations during operation of those tunnels 24 hours every single day.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved as I suspect that another reason for the twin tunnels underneath homes is also because it will provide a way in which developers may be able to acquire as much land as possible for future development and that developers will be putting the pressure on residents in the not too distant future to try and acquire our properties should we start complaining about damages from construction of the twin tunnels underneath homes, or noise or vibrations from post construction operations. I read in a document on the newparrard website about the proposed Urban Transformation entitled '*Sydney CBD to Parramatta Strategic Transport Plan September 2015*' which states, I quote:

“Commercial uses front onto Parramatta Road, typically abutting residential uses behind them, including neighbourhoods of predominantly freestanding housing. Many are on large allotments, which makes them highly attractive for redevelopment.”

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because the same document entitled '*Sydney CBD to Parramatta Strategic Transport Plan September 2015*' suggests that the residential area one block back from Parramatta Road will be suitable and is already earmarked for development up to 4 stories high. Looking at where the twin tunnels are proposed and taking into consideration an area of 50 metres from the outer side of the tunnel which is closer to Parramatta Road corresponds approximately with what is suggested that the developers will desire for future development, so it makes strategic sense for those designing the motorway twin tunnels and for those working closely with the Urban Transformation project to place the twin tunnels underneath our homes so there would be maximum land available for redevelopment when residents have had enough of tunnel related problems should these arise and then decide to sell up and move away, and this would be a big win for the developers but a huge loss for the residents especially those who had planned their long term lives and futures in this area and had paid a lot of money to own a house and land here.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes because Volume 2E Appendix O of the EIS describes the effects of subsurface ground human intervention and soil salinisation and I have concerns:

I object to the M4 East preferred design route of twin tunnels underneath homes as I have concerns about possible changes to the salinity levels of the soil on my property due to the proposed "disturbance of the subsurface ground by human intervention" as stated in Volume 2E Appendix O of the EIS. Volume 1B Chapter 15 Subsection 15.2.1 under the heading of Soils – Soil landscape and geology states that "Urban salinity becomes a problem when the natural hydrogeological balance is disturbed by human interaction through changes to the water balance Small changes in sensitive areas can result in the balance being altered and salinisation occurring." I object to my property being affected by soil salinity issues. I do not want the water levels under my land to be changed which may affect our gardens and the health and survival of our plants and lawns and my Tallowood tree which is a protected tree under the council's Tree Preservation Order and stands in the path of the tunnel.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes because Volume 2H Appendix T covers Flora and Fauna and I have concerns:

I object to the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes being approved because I have a very tall Tallowwood tree in my back yard which grows right in the path of one of the twin tunnels and which is a protected tree under Burwood Council's Tree Preservation Order. This tree is over 30 years old and over 25 metres tall and provides a safe place and a constant food supply for Australian birds such as Rainbow Lorikeets, Magpies, Cockatoos and other birds. This tree also contributes to lowering carbon emissions in this area. I have serious concerns of how possible changes to the underground water levels and of how possible increases of soil salinity may affect this protected tree and also the possible effects of soil salinity and changes to underground water levels and their effects on my existing gardens and lawns.

I object the M4 East preferred design route underneath homes as Volume 2E Appendix B of the EIS covers demographic indicators, the graph shows large numbers of residents have non-Australian backgrounds and I have concerns:

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because it may be easy for WestConnex representatives to say write a submission for the EIS but many may find it extremely difficult to interpret such a large pile of 10 volumes of documents totalling around 5,000 pages and may have little chance of knowing what to write or submit. Volume 2E Appendix B of the EIS covers demographic indicators and the graph indicates a large number of residents are from non-Australian backgrounds and I feel the EIS has failed to address the inclusiveness of different groups of people, those from non-English speaking backgrounds, the elderly, people with disabilities who may find it both mentally difficult to understand the EIS or physically difficult to go to a place to view the EIS.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because I note in Volume 2E Appendix D of the EIS headed Council consultations both Ashfield and Burwood Councils expressed concerns that people from non-English speaking backgrounds should be assisted with interpretation in the EIS process. This concern was also raised at the Ashfield Council/WestConnex meeting at Ashfield Town Hall on 23rd September 2015. The representative responded that they have an interpreter service available, but how would a person from a non-English speaking background know what questions to ask if they can't read or understand basics of the EIS or how could they have the whole ten volumes interpreted to them, how many times would they have to call the interpreter service and how many hours would they have to spend on the telephone or at interpreter sessions?

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because many residents in my area are from non-English speaking backgrounds and they struggle with the English language so they may have little chance of putting in a submission due to their lack of understanding the EIS and expressed this.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because there are many elderly people also who reside in my local area along the corridor of the motorway twin tunnels and are directly affected by this project and it is highly unlikely they own computers with the latest technology or have the ability to view documents of the size and nature of the EIS or understand the content or have the ability to make several trips to their local council or to other places due to their old age and their inability to physically get around easily or spend long periods of time making these trips to view large piles of EIS documents. I object because my elderly neighbours have homes positioned over the proposed tunnels and they speak little English and find it difficult to get around due to their old age. How do they respond to the EIS? It is an unfair situation for them to be placed in and they are at a real disadvantage and may be unable to respond and they are at a high risk of exclusion.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because many people may not be familiar with interpreting documents such as the EIS or how to read them or know how or where to start even if there were information sessions for this purpose. I object because residents informed me they did not know what to do or how to go about writing a submission. I object because I found it difficult myself to understand the documents and to allocate enough time to read them in such a short period of time. It took me ten whole days to read the ten volumes and I had no chance of understanding some of the technical data even though I am somewhat familiar with reading technical data due to my experience with project work. I covered around one whole volume per day and consider myself as a person of average intelligence with a good understanding of the English language. It took me around 15 hours to read through only Volumes 1A and 1B of the EIS but I do not understand how someone from a non-English speaking background or an elderly person or a mentally challenged person would understand technical data such as that in the EIS or even understand other parts of the content of the EIS and it is a disadvantage for them to live along the corridor and not understand.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because I feel it was not appropriate that sections were left out of the EIS and subsequently only a very small extension period of time was added to the deadline to respond to such an enormous document such as the EIS.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved as it was not appropriate that the EIS was released for comment during a time when the New South Wales school holidays fell right in the middle of the EIS submission period and this affected our family. Releasing the EIS with the school holidays falling within the period of time to respond essentially took two weeks away from the period available to read, decipher, break down and digest the documents and then write a submission. It is not fair for parents to spend time during the holidays to stay home and read ten volumes of documents when they should be spending precious quality time and having some fun with their children during the school holidays instead of staying home to read the EIS or rushing back from their school holiday vacation to read and decipher ten volumes of documents and then write a submission as well by the deadline.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because I feel that innocent residents are being treated harshly in relation to the plan to construct this motorway and the twin tunnels and I have concerns:

I object to the M4 East preferred design being approved because Volume 1A Chapter 7 Section 7.6.1 of the EIS and Volume 2A Appendix D of the EIS and Volume 1B Section 12.3 of the EIS and Volume 1B Section 14.4.4 of the EIS refer to acquisitions and I feel it is inappropriate the way in which Sydney residents have been told by those with authority, before this project has even been approved, that they will lose their homes under acquisition, homes will be demolished, we will have tunnels under our homes and our subsurface land will be acquired. The way in which we have been spoken to is not the Australian way and is really awful and this type of communication creates angst. People should not be spoken with like this in a way which frightens them, and it would not be tolerated in a workplace as it could be treated as a form of bullying and harassment, and people should not be treated like this within society either. I thought Australia was a place where people could expect to live in safety without fearing harassment. I have witnessed residents being shown little to no empathy during the consultation process, as I too was shown lack of empathy for raising concerns.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because residents are feeling like they were not actively involved in the process nor informed about the preferred design route before a tender was accepted. What has happened to moral values in this country? I believe people are retaliating in defence to protect themselves and their properties.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because the EIS mentions that the motorway will connect communities however I feel that the WestConnex M4 East motorway project is already upsetting people all over Sydney and for many reasons, and not just upsetting those in the inner west areas. I have lived in Sydney all my life and in the suburb of Croydon for 32 years and I have never seen people this upset before. Communities of people are upset as this project is already tearing their lives apart before construction has even begun. Residents are frightened and my neighbours even sold their beautiful federation home after residing there for over 30 years as they were frightened and did not want to live above a tunnel that is planned for here. What a shame as they had just completed costly renovations before being informed of the proposed tunnel and then sold their home, a hard working couple who work with young people in our local community but who are now leaving.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because the EIS mentions that the motorway will connect communities but residents in Sydney have been name called for raising concerns and innocent residents here with real concerns about huge tunnels underneath their fragile old homes have been disrespectfully name called '*numbys*'. How can those who name call or make judgements know what we are feeling or know our real concerns when they are not faced with those real concerns themselves. It is an insult to be name called for raising real concerns and has negative effects on residents health and wellbeing.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because the EIS mentions that the motorway will connect communities but it is already evident that this is not the case. I feel you cannot weigh up the needs or concerns of one group, the drivers from the outer western suburbs and the drivers of the freight trucks to and from the ports, against the needs or concerns of another group, the residents who already live here in the inner west suburbs and those who have lived here already over a long period of time and paid a lot of money to purchase homes in an area closer to the city, because then the situation becomes unfair and by implying that the motorway is for the good of the majority is unfair and it appears that the majority of the inner west residents are opposed to the motorway so to imply it is for the majority is not true.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because I am sure that most people, as I do too, want Parramatta Road cleaned up and made nice and vibrant and with some development, with a better traffic flow and with more public transport options but not like this with brutal force and with a motorway design that was shrouded in mystery until release of the EIS.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because even if a tender has already been accepted, it was indicated by the Roads Minister in media releases up until the announcement of the preferred design route in June 2015 that 'the M4 East tunnels to run under Parramatta Road' then that should be reason to place the tunnels underneath the existing Parramatta Road alignment like the concept design which was shown to the public and where the motorway will have the least impact on residents.

I object to the M4 East preferred design route being approved because Volume 1B Chapter 30 on page 27.6 states the tunnel route was optimised to reduce the length however this is was never mentioned at the consultations even after I questioned why the route was changed to underneath homes, and by placing the tunnels underneath homes it is a cost saving before people and their homes and the EIS mentions in Volume 1A Table 4.2 that the disadvantage is that the tunnels will be underneath homes. It is not fair to change the motorway design route suddenly, even if the route was already changed behind the scenes and a tender was accepted. I object because of the lack of transparency in the process and I object because residents did not have their say about the preferred design route during the planning process. Residents here do not want huge tunnels underneath their homes and they have indicated this in the petition handed to the Mayor of Burwood Council.

Political Donations Disclosure:

I have not made any political donations.

Privacy Statement:

I confirm that I have read the terms of the Privacy Statement on the website www.planning.nsw.gov.au/privacy

End of my submission for Application SSI 6307 M4 East motorway EIS