

This is an objection to SSI 14_6788 M5 East Motorway between King Georges Road, Beverly Hills and St Peters; the 'New M5' project; which comprises of a new, tolled multi-lane road link between the M5 East Motorway east of King Georges Road and St Peters. The project would also include an interchange at St Peters and connection to the existing road network.

I object to this proposal, as it will have devastating impacts on the local community and fails to provide a long-term solution to traffic and congestion. I will outline the reasoning behind my objection to the project below.

This section of the Westconnex project is known as Stage 2 and consists of three components:

- The M5-King Georges Road interchange;
- This project (the subject of this State significant infrastructure application report); and
- The Sydney Gateway (linking the St Peters Interchange with Sydney Airport).¹

Traffic modelling by independent consultants show the modelling by AECOM (which also prepared this EIS) is unsound. AECOM is a company with a questionable professional record² and has been awarded contracts in the Westconnex project for both construction

¹ 1.1

<https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/78cfa8428678f0eac63c278c75acc440/Amended%20WestConnex%20New%20M5%20SSI%20Application%20Report.pdf>

² Insolvency firm KordaMentha accuses AECOM of 'misleading and deceptive conduct' and making 'negligent misstatements' by ambitiously forecasting more than 100,000 vehicles a day while actual traffic volumes only totalled 22,000 a day. The insolvency firm also alleges Aecom had predicted future demand by referencing a 'one-hour demand forecast from a two-hour weekday peak-hour period' without 'allowance for seasonal adjustments' including school holidays. "We believe the work done by Aecom to support their traffic forecasts was substandard. We have engaged third party experts to review their output," says KordaMentha partner Martin Madden. After RCM's Clem Jones Tunnel (Clem7) consistently failed to meet projected targets, the group financially collapsed in February 2011 with debts totalling \$1.3 billion.

<http://www.businessnewsaus.com.au/articles/traffic-forecasters-sued-for-clem7-numbers.html>

and assessing environmental risks - a clear conflict of interest. AECOM was the subject of legal action in Queensland, where more than 650 investors sued the company for allegedly inflating traffic predictions for a private toll-way in Brisbane.³ Receivers and financiers of the \$1.68 billion RiverCity Motor Group are believed to have reached an out-of-court settlement with AECOM, reliably estimated to be as much as \$700 million.⁴

AECOM has a questionable prediction record⁵ and has also been awarded contracts in the Westconnex project for construction, as well as assessing environmental risks and preparing this EIS - a clear conflict of interest.

The EIS does nothing to address the health and safety concerns and the social impact that the motorway will have on the local area. Particularly the impact of the St Peters Interchange on Alexandria.

The report provides no data or concrete evidence to support assertions about the need for the project or the reason why alternatives were not preferred.

- The report states that a 'review of all available research was carried out'. The review omits discussion of important research and reports, which are highly relevant to this evaluation.
- The proposal should not be considered in isolation but as part of projects including developments and initiatives

³ <http://www.wsj.com/articles/aecom-technology-says-australia-toll-road-lawsuit-could-hurt-result-1407925288>

⁴ <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/dataroom/rivercity-motor-group-in-168bn-legal-settlement/story-fnjw8txa-1227457810858>

⁵ Insolvency firm KordaMentha accuses AECOM of 'misleading and deceptive conduct' and making 'negligent misstatements' by ambitiously forecasting more than 100,000 vehicles a day while actual traffic volumes only totalled 22,000 a day. The insolvency firm also alleges Aecom had predicted future demand by referencing a 'one-hour demand forecast from a two-hour weekday peak-hour period' without 'allowance for seasonal adjustments' including school holidays. "We believe the work done by Aecom to support their traffic forecasts was substandard. We have engaged third party experts to review their output," says KordaMentha partner Martin Madden. After RCM's Clem Jones Tunnel (Clem7) consistently failed to meet projected targets, the group financially collapsed in February 2011 with debts totalling \$1.3 billion.

<http://www.businessnewsaus.com.au/articles/traffic-forecasters-sued-for-clem7-numbers.html>

undertaken by other government entities in the path of the project. It appears the Department of Planning, Department of Transport and RMS (WDA/SMC) are not communicating with respect to projects, for example the CBD and South East Light Rail (CSELR) project. The proposed benefits of the CSELR will be negated by the Westconnex project, as the WestConnex project will ultimately funnel traffic into the CBD, which will have a further reduced capacity for vehicle traffic.

- The actions undermine previous conditions of approval for the original M5.
- References to potential offsets and mitigation in the absence of any design or specific detail are meaningless.

I attended the Westconnex Development Authority/ Sydney Motorway Corporation information 'pop-up' at St Peters on Saturday, 12 December, and frankly, gained very little out of it. I felt, along with other attendees, that this was merely an exercise in ticking a box to denote there has been consultation with the community. I drew attention to Jack McGovern, a WDA/SMC community engagement officer, that there are people in the Alexandria community who either have mobility issues and could not attend such 'pop-ups' or were simply unaware they were occurring, as there has been no letterboxing in the community. Communicating with property owners and occupants regarding the impact of Westconnex on property should include door knocking affected properties, sending letters and formal correspondence, meeting these stakeholders face-to-face and distributing information packages on the process. WDA/SMC is an entity of RMS, and as such, owes a duty to community members. It is inexcusable that the well-placed concerns of residents and traffic/transport experts (who are not on the WDA/SMC bandwagon) have been rejected.

Business Case

The Westconnex business case released in November was sanitised, that is the figures have been blacked out. Redacting information is normally intended to allow the selective disclosure of information in a document while keeping other parts of the

document secret. Typically the result is a document that is suitable for dissemination to others than the intended audience of the original document. In the context of government documents, *redaction* is the process of removing sensitive or classified information from a document prior to its publication, during declassification.

The Westconnex project business case should not be full of redacted information. It is the taxpayer who is funding these private sector/government contracts. Decisions on whether matters that involve a government should, or should not, be disclosed involve a consideration of the public interest. Any party arguing for non-disclosure should be able to substantiate its case for such an approach.

Government use of contracts to achieve public goals is quite different to how contracts are used in the private sector, because:

1. accountability to the legislature and the people;
2. legislative provisions requiring the proper and efficient expenditure of public money;
3. general legal presumptions that government should act as a moral exemplar in the market place; and
4. public policy constraints on governments' use of contract law

In handling commercial information, Government agencies must abide by a commitment to as full disclosure as possible. In the absence of some overriding public interest against disclosure, it would generally be expected that the terms or key features of a contract would be open to public scrutiny. The obligation of the Government to account for its management of taxpayer's resources means that commercial information must be disclosed.

There is no 'public interest immunity' for non-disclosure. There is no countervailing public interest in denying access to documents or other information that outweighs the legislature's and the public's interest in disclosure. This argument may be accepted with regard to the records of Cabinet discussions and advice tendered by public servants to Ministers, in areas concerning military

security or the privacy of diplomatic communications where publicity might actually damage the public interest. But not building road and transport infrastructure that is changing Sydney.

Local roads are at capacity, especially during morning and afternoon peak periods and on weekends

The proposed motorway does not provide any amenity to the local community of Alexandria in any aspect of the proposal.

[Amended SEARs 16 June 2015.pdf](#)

General Requirements

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared in accordance with, and meet minimum requirements.

An analysis of the project in accordance with clause 7(1)(d) Sch 2 of the *environmental planning and assessment regulation 2000*

7 Content of [environmental](#) impact statement

(1) An [environmental](#) impact statement must also include each of the following:

- (a) a summary of the [environmental](#) impact statement,
- (b) a statement of the objectives of the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#),
- (c) an analysis of any feasible alternatives to the carrying out of the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#), having regard to its objectives, including the consequences of not carrying out the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#),
- (d) an analysis of the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#), including:
 - (i) a full description of the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#), and
 - (ii) a general description of the [environment](#) likely to be affected by the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#), together with a detailed description of those aspects of the [environment](#) that are likely to be significantly affected, and
 - (iii) the likely impact on the [environment](#) of the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#), and

- (iv) a full description of the measures proposed to mitigate any adverse effects of the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#) on the [environment](#), and
- (v) a list of any [approvals](#) that must be obtained under any other Act or law before the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#) may lawfully be carried out,
- (e) a compilation (in a single section of the [environmental](#) impact statement) of the measures referred to in item (d) (iv),
- (f) the reasons justifying the carrying out of the development, [activity](#) or [infrastructure](#) in the manner proposed, having regard to biophysical, economic and social considerations, including the principles of ecologically sustainable development set out in sub clause (4).

Traffic and Transport

An objective of this project is to "relieve road congestion so as to improve the speed, reliability and safety of travel in the M4 and M5 corridor, including parallel arterial roads." A report by SGS Economics & Planning commissioned by the City of Sydney found that the motorway is unlikely to reduce traffic on local roads, exposes the public to huge financial risk, and will not benefit a large proportion of Sydney commuters, including those in Western Sydney. (SGS 2015; Saulwick 2015). Independent experts argue that motorways induce rather than remove traffic. (Zeibots, 2007, Zeibots, 2009). The traffic modeling has been manipulated to give the answers the NSW government wants.

Traffic Modeling

Traffic modeling has been given a limited to consideration. No consideration has been given to other streets that would be affected, such as Maddox and Lawrence Streets, or Lawrence, Belmont and Euston lanes that would be used as "rat-runs" to avoid the congested Euston and Mitchell Roads, further exacerbating traffic congestion in and around Alexandria.

Westconnex representatives said at the Enmore Theatre community meeting 23 February 2015 that “the percentage of trips taken by car will not change”.⁶ However, NSW Bureau of Transport Statistics show that in the decade to 2012, the population grew by 12%, car driver trips grew only 6%, while trips by bus and train increased by 16% and 23% respectively.⁷ At the same community meeting, it was said that if the M4-M5 Link is not built, the same amount of traffic “will still find a way through your area”. This flies in the face of research overseas and in Australia, which consistently finds that adding extra roads encourages more traffic, while closing roads results in less traffic.⁸ The 2007 OECD European Conference of Ministers of Transport report put forward policy-oriented, research-based recommendations for effectively managing traffic congestion and eliminating excessive congestion in large urban areas. Of which Australia was a party to this conference.⁹

It was found that care should be given to consider the downstream impacts of releasing greater traffic flows through previously contained bottlenecks. Great care should be taken to at least address what the network effects will be over the mid- to long-term of such bottleneck treatments.¹⁰ They go on to say that building new road infrastructure is often constrained by a lack of space in dense urban cores *and is nearly always an expensive proposition even in the outlying peripheries of urban areas.*

Most suburban streets do not have vehicle weight limits so residents will feel the impact of heavy vehicles. Roads and Maritime Services modelling prepared early in 2015, shows traffic volumes for roads around inner Sydney and the third stage of WestConnex – a tunnel from St Peters to Haberfield - before and after this tunnel is built. Along King Street, the RMS figures show a continual increase in cars travelling in the morning and afternoon

⁶ LINK TO 1.39 video of meeting

<https://publish.viostream.com/play/179qaabn7j1nq>

⁷ <http://www.bts.nsw.gov.au/Statistics/Travel-Forecasts/Travel-Forecasts/default.aspx?FolderID=221#top>

⁸ <http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/Pub/pdf/07Congestion.pdf>

⁹ <http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/Pub/pdf/07Congestion.pdf>

¹⁰ page 23

<http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/Pub/pdf/07Congestion.pdf>

peak hours between the years 2011, 2026 and 2036. There is a similar story for other major roads around the inner south of Sydney, including the already congested Botany Road, O'Riordan Street, Cleveland Street and Southern Cross Drive. The modelling challenges claims that construction of the motorway will quieten local roads.¹¹ Figures obtained by Fairfax Media were created within RMS using the department's strategic traffic forecasting model. The documents include information about when the model created the traffic forecasts. The forecasts do not align with the traffic forecasts released by the WDA for the first stage of the project, the widened M4 motorway. The WDA is using traffic forecasts for 2021 and 2031, as opposed to the figures for 2026 and 2036 obtained by Fairfax Media.¹²

The accuracy of traffic forecasts is of considerable interest in the toll road sector. One of the unresolved issues is that of the poor performance of traffic forecasts on proposed toll roads and tunnels in urban Australia. The ratio of actual traffic on opening a toll road facility to that of the forecast traffic confirms the optimism bias that has been identified.¹³ In Australia, it has become clear that the traffic projections for most toll roads have been built around the financial model, not vice versa as it should be. And the financial model has been structured in such a way as to “upfront” or bring forward the project cash flows so bankers and their consultants could pocket billions of dollars in fees before even a cent was earned in tolls.¹⁴

¹¹ <http://www.smh.com.au/nsw/sydney-traffic-secret-westconnex-documents-show-worse-congestion-after-toll-road-20150525-gh980u.html#ixzz3pNz1y4s4>

¹² <http://www.smh.com.au/nsw/sydney-traffic-secret-westconnex-documents-show-worse-congestion-after-toll-road-20150525-gh980u.html#ixzz3pNzjnEVW>

¹³ Black, J. (2014) Traffic Risk in the Australian Toll Road Sector in PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE BULLETIN Vol 1 Issue 9 at page 10
<http://epublications.bond.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1058&context=pi>
b

¹⁴ Black, J. (2014) Traffic Risk in the Australian Toll Road Sector in PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE BULLETIN Vol 1 Issue 9 at page 10
<http://epublications.bond.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1058&context=pi>
b

Bureau of Transport NSW household travel survey statistics¹⁵ released in 2013 show that:

In support of NSW 2021 goals, public transport and walking trips grew at a faster rate (23% for train, 16% for bus, and 15% for walking trips) than private vehicle trips (6% for car driver trips and 6% for car passenger trips) in the past decade.

Social/recreational trips and education/childcare trips increased the most (17% for each), while work-related business trips (-17%) and personal business trips (-16%) fell.

Over the decade, the data shows the population grew by 12%, distance travelled for education/childcare grew by 30%, implying children are travelling further and are increasingly less likely to go to their closest school. Distance travelled for personal business decreased by 20% over the same time period, consistent with the growth of the internet and mobile technologies.

The total daily travel time per person remained unchanged at 79 minutes.^{16 17}

Then there is the Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services Sydney CBD projects, which involves a series of transport infrastructure projects across greater Sydney with a key focus on the city centre.¹⁸ Part of the CBD works is the construction and operation of a light rail service from Circular Quay to Kingsford and Randwick via Surry Hills, including approximately 20 light rail stops, interchanges at ferry, rail and bus stations along the route and the transformation of a section of George Street between Hunter Street and Bathurst Street, Sydney into a

¹⁵ <http://www.bts.nsw.gov.au/ArticleDocuments/79/r2013-08-hts-summary.pdf.aspx>

¹⁶ Page 9 <http://www.bts.nsw.gov.au/ArticleDocuments/79/r2013-08-hts-summary.pdf.aspx>

¹⁷ Page 23 Sydneysiders spent an average of 79 minutes travelling each weekday. This has remained unchanged for the last decade.

<http://www.bts.nsw.gov.au/ArticleDocuments/79/r2013-08-hts-summary.pdf.aspx>

¹⁸ <http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/vision/city-transformation>

pedestrian zone.¹⁹ The EIS of the CBD and South East Light Rail (CSELR) project states it was necessary to transform the transport system within inner Sydney to provide a change in transport capability, reliability and capacity.²⁰ This was in response to problems from congestion reducing productivity and urban amenity, which created transport congestion, unreliability, significant economic and social impacts and a degraded environment (particularly along the George Street corridor). The CSELR is to free up road capacity by transferring CBD trips from existing buses and private vehicles onto the light rail and along the proposed George Street pedestrian zone. Along with Sydney bus network changes as part of the Sydney City Centre Access Strategy (SCCAS), the CSELR proposal would lead to approximately 220 fewer bus trips during the morning peak periods within the CBD.²¹

The EIS of the CSELR project noted that the transport system does not have the capacity to support growth — in response the CSELR is to support future economic growth by improving public transport capacity, quality and reliability.²²

The proposed benefits of the CSELR would be negated with the Westconnex project in its entirety, as the WestConnex project will ultimately funnel traffic into the CBD, which will have a further reduced capacity for vehicle traffic. The planning processes of both projects do not take into account their respective impacts.

¹⁹

http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=6042

²⁰ page E-3

<https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/ee4241b76393b91aea89ae55b47ffd8d/01%20CSELR%20EIS%20-%20Table%20of%20Contents%20and%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>

²¹ page E-3

<https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/ee4241b76393b91aea89ae55b47ffd8d/01%20CSELR%20EIS%20-%20Table%20of%20Contents%20and%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>

²² page E-3

<https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/ee4241b76393b91aea89ae55b47ffd8d/01%20CSELR%20EIS%20-%20Table%20of%20Contents%20and%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>

AIRPORT

The construction of Sydney's second airport is to begin this year (2016). The runway will be able to accommodate the largest plane in the sky — the A380. A 3km transport tunnel has been earmarked on the schematics for a future underground rail link to the airport.

The first stage, which will be completed within eight years and be able to take 10 million passengers a year. The final configuration would elevate the Badgerys Creek airport to a world-ranking facility, with twin parallel 3.7km runways by 2050. The final design reveals a major international airport complex forecast to take 80 million passengers a year, twice the number currently serviced by Sydney Airport at Mascot.

<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/nsw/badgerys-creek-airport-sydneys-bold-plan-is-taking-wing/story-fni0cx12-1227304121459>

The airport passenger numbers projected by the Westconnex EIS at Sydney Airport above do not co-relate with the numbers projected by the Badgery's Creek passenger numbers.

Singapore airlines are introducing international flights to Canberra's airport this year (2016).

Urban Design and Visual Amenity

The Paperbark and Port Jackson fig trees on Campbell St and Euston Rd are set for removal and / or relocation. Replacing these mature trees with saplings is not good enough, these *trees* and the *canopy* cover they provide are important for urban amenity and local amenity.

These trees should remain and any development be designed to provide these trees with space, as would be the case with a corner park or by designing any development with sufficient setbacks to allow the trees to remain and to survive.

The trees in front of my building, along with the seven Port Jackson Fig trees (approx. 100 years old) opposite are beautiful visual qualities present in existing landscape. They provide not only a *visual* buffer, but also auditory and *psychological* buffer to existing traffic on Euston Road. To remove these trees would specifically impact adversely on the residents of Euston Road.

NOISE

The level of 74 decibels seems benign and is explained as benign in the EIS. The potential for a sound to damage our hearing is proportional to its intensity, not its loudness. That's why it's misleading to rely on our subjective perception of loudness as an indication of the risk to our hearing. Particularly when this noise level is conservatively estimated for traffic noise that will essentially be non-stop. Twenty-four / seven.

Population of the local area

There are large-scale residential developments in the Alexandria area that will impact in terms of road congestion, public transport, as well as childcare, education and medical facilities in the vicinity of the proposed development.

There is a current lack of transport and road infrastructure to support the existing population:

- Local roads are at capacity, especially during morning and afternoon peak periods and on weekends;
- Both Erskineville and Redfern railway stations are over capacity, with only four services to the City from Erskineville in the morning peak period, and a similar number servicing the evening peak period;
- Bus services are over capacity by the time they reach Mitchell Road and offer infrequent services; further, all bus services terminate at Redfern Station during the construction

of the CBD light rail, adding further pressure to the over-capacity of Redfern Station

No infrastructure is planned to alleviate these existing problems.

The areas near Coulson Street and Mitchell Road are noted flood-prone areas that are affected during episodes of even moderate rainfall, but especially so during the more frequent heavy rainstorms we now experience.

During the Anzac 2015 mega hail storm, Coulson Street, which branches off Mitchell Road, flooded and there was extensive resultant stormwater damage to numerous vehicles, as well as road closures at the intersection of Mitchell Road and Coulson Street.

Traffic modeling has been limited to consideration of Mitchell Road only (as stated by representatives of consultants AECOM). No consideration has been given to other streets that would be affected by this development, such as Lawrence and Belmont Streets and their associated laneways, and Euston Lane, which would be used as “rat-runs” to avoid a congested Mitchell Road. They are now and it will only continue. No consideration (again, as stated by AECOM) has been given to the Westconnex project that would see up to 60,000 cars per day exit the tollway portal at St Peters, further exacerbating traffic congestion in and around Alexandria.

How close is a major road allowed to be built next to residences?

The business case says the Alexandria Landfill site at St Peters was identified as suitable for the construction of the eastern portal of the main tunnels. The site was considered large enough to accommodate the required construction activities, while minimising impacts to the surrounding community (page 136). *There will be "Euston Road widening – to improve connectivity to Alexandria"* (page 137). Euston Road is being upgraded as part of the local road upgrades to support the integration of the St Peters

Interchange. *Following the upgrade, the road is predicted to carry an extra 50,000 (not a typo - fifty thousand) vehicles (page 39).*

This is quite frightening. Not only for residents of Euston Road like myself, but residents along McEvoy St, Maddox St, Lawrence St, Fountain St and Mitchell Road.

There are several major problems with this proposal. Firstly, it will impact greatly on the residents in the buildings at 125 Euston Road and 93 – 103 Euston Road. The residents at 125 Euston Road will literally have 7 lanes of traffic at their front door, with virtually no 'buffer' zone between the widened road and their front door.

RMS is negotiating on behalf of Westconnex with the owner of the lots in front of our building (the original developer, who incidentally, was bankrupted from sloppy property developments), to purchase these lots to widen Euston Road from 4 to 7 lanes to Maddox Street. We have copies of correspondence from the RMS stating this (see A, B, C and D below).

My neighbours in unit one, who have also objected and been to the media, will have less than one metre between their bedroom windows and 7 lanes of traffic. How is it safe to propose traffic so close to a residential building. To a family's bedroom windows? What happens if there are vehicle collisions at this intersection, as there almost certainly be at some point? Where is the safety margin between the traffic and the front doors of this building? I don't think those involved in the project have physically attended the sites they propose to build roads through. I don't think they have considered the developments of the Ashmore Estate and Green Square surrounding Alexandria. They must have a duty to attend and speak with residents now, rather than later.

How are people able to live a relatively normal existence with this amount of traffic (and the associated noise and pollution) at their front doors and outside their windows? The same applies to our neighbouring building, the residents at 93 – 103 Euston Road, with many of those apartments having bedrooms windows facing directly onto Euston Road. And of course there are also the apartment buildings that are on the stretch of Euston Road

between Maddox Street and Harley Street. These residents too will also be subject to increased traffic and associated noise.

In anybody's language, it is not reasonable to have traffic right up to the front door of a building that was not designed and built to cope with this volume of traffic and this level of noise. Maybe traffic of this volume could be tolerated by the residents if there was a five metre buffer zone between the traffic and their front door. But these building were NOT designed, nor built with the idea that very high volumes of traffic could be coming past the front door 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and nor is there proposed suitable distance/buffer between the building and the road/traffic.

That RMS is negotiating with a liquidator, should have set off alarm bells. There is a general legal presumption that government and government entities should act as a moral exemplar in the market place. I would argue that there is an obligation on the RMS as a government entity to account for its management of taxpayer's resources by disclosing, as a courtesy at the very least, to those who will be directly affected by these dealings

A

I have attached a copy of the reply that was sent in response to your email to RMS Customer Services.

Copy of Strata Plan 67711 attached shows an area of land on the Euston Road frontage of the Strata boundary (Lot 3 in Deposited Plan 1003248) which is separate from the Strata Common Property boundaries.

As stated on the reply, any Property Inquiries for this Strata and Strata Plan 72036 received in RMS are advised that although no part of the Strata is affected by any RMS road proposals, an area of land adjoining the properties (Lots 3 and 4 in DP 1003248 and Lot 101 in DP 1068264 – Lot 3 in DP 1003248 in this case) is reserved for future road widening.

regards

Lindsay Bangsrove
Senior Property Officer
Project Development | Infrastructure Development
T 02 8849 2093 F (02) 8849 2750
www.rms.nsw.gov.au
Every journey matters

Roads and Maritime Services
Level 5 Argyle Street Parramatta NSW 2150

B

GE 15/11028 – 125 Euston Road Alexandria

The subject property being 125 Euston Road Alexandria , known as SP 67711, is not and has never been affected by any RMS road widening reservation.

Adjacent to the subject property the land known as lot 3 in DP 1003248 has been subject to a road widening reservation since 1989 and is required for ancillary works as part of the Westconnex. Lot 3 in DP 1003248 is in private ownership and has never been a public road or public reserve. RMS is currently in the process of acquiring this land for the Westconnex.

If a prospective purchaser of any of the units within SP 67711 submitted a property enquirey to RMS then they would be advised that no part of SP 67711 was required for road widening but that the adjoining parcel of land being lot 3 in DP 1003248 was totally affected by a road widening reservation and required for future road widening.


Additionally, the Local Environment Plan prepared by Sydney Council would have defined the zoning of the land adjoining the subject property, being lot 3 in DP 1003248, as SP2-Classified Road.

In reference to the comments about loss of privacy and noise pollution this complaint should be referred to the Westconnex project team being Tony Dixon

C

Land and Property Information Division
ABN: 84 104 377 806
GPO BOX 15
Sydney NSW 2001
DX 17 SYDNEY

Telephone: 1300 052 637



**Land & Property
Information**
A division of the Department of Finance & Services

TITLE SEARCH

Title Reference: 4/1003248

LAND AND PROPERTY INFORMATION NEW SOUTH WALES - TITLE SEARCH

FOLIO: 4/1003248

SEARCH DATE	TIME	EDITION NO	DATE
23/10/2015	10:58 PM	7	24/1/2005

LAND

LOT 4 IN DEPOSITED PLAN 1003248
AT ALEXANDRIA
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA SYDNEY
PARISH OF ALEXANDRIA COUNTY OF CUMBERLAND
TITLE DIAGRAM DP1003248

FIRST SCHEDULE

ARRRAY INVESTMENTS PTY LIMITED (T 9204568)

SECOND SCHEDULE (2 NOTIFICATIONS)

1 RESERVATIONS AND CONDITIONS IN THE CROWN GRANT(S)
* 2 AH763602 CAVEAT BY AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND BANKING GROUP
LIMITED

NOTATIONS

UNREGISTERED DEALINGS: NIL

*** END OF SEARCH ***


PRINTED ON 23/10/2015

* ANY ENTRIES PRECEDED BY AN ASTERISK DO NOT APPEAR ON THE CURRENT EDITION OF THE CERTIFICATE OF TITLE.
WARNING: THE INFORMATION APPEARING UNDER NOTATIONS HAS NOT BEEN FORMALLY RECORDED IN THE REGISTER.

1

D

Land and Property Information Division
ABN: 84 104 377 806
GPO BOX 15
Sydney NSW 2001
DX 17 SYDNEY
Telephone: 1300 052 637

 **Land & Property Information**
A division of the Department of Finance & Services

TITLE SEARCH

Title Reference: 3/1003248

LAND AND PROPERTY INFORMATION NEW SOUTH WALES - TITLE SEARCH

FOLIO: 3/1003248

SEARCH DATE	TIME	EDITION NO	DATE
23/10/2015	10:47 PM	4	11/12/2002

LAND

LOT 3 IN DEPOSITED PLAN 1003248
AT ALEXANDRIA
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA SYDNEY
PARISH OF ALEXANDRIA COUNTY OF CUMBERLAND
TITLE DIAGRAM DP1003248

FIRST SCHEDULE

ARKBAY INVESTMENTS PTY LIMITED (T 9207975)

SECOND SCHEDULE (2 NOTIFICATIONS)

1 RESERVATIONS AND CONDITIONS IN THE CROWN GRANT(S)
* 2 AH763601 CAVEAT BY AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND BANKING GROUP LIMITED

NOTATIONS

NOTE: THE CERTIFICATE OF TITLE FOR THIS FOLIO OF THE REGISTER DOES NOT INCLUDE SECURITY FEATURES INCLUDED ON COMPUTERISED CERTIFICATES OF TITLE ISSUED FROM 4TH JANUARY, 2004. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT STRINGENT PROCESSES ARE ADOPTED IN VERIFYING THE IDENTITY OF THE PERSON(S) CLAIMING A RIGHT TO DEAL WITH THE LAND COMPRISED IN THIS FOLIO.
UNREGISTERED DEALINGS: NIL

*** END OF SEARCH ***

PRINTED ON 23/10/2015

* ANY ENTRIES PRECEDED BY AN ASTERISK DO NOT APPEAR ON THE CURRENT EDITION OF THE CERTIFICATE OF TITLE.
WARNING: THE INFORMATION APPEARING UNDER NOTATIONS HAS NOT BEEN FORMALLY RECORDED IN THE REGISTER.

1

Conclusion

I object to the proposed New M5 as it will have devastating impacts on my local community, the communities it is to go through and fails to provide a long term solution to traffic and congestion.

Sincerely,
Yolanda Floro