

## SUBMISSION TO M5 EIS

Name: Associate Professor Mark Boyd MD, FRACP

Full address: 1d Goddard Street, Erskineville, NSW 2043

I strongly object to the proposed New M5.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable level of service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS:

\* Green Square: 61,000 residents

\* Ashmore: 6,000 residents

\* Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents

\* Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers

With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in the huge increase in density that will occur in the area.

The EIS clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads in the Alexandria area will deteriorate as a result of *West Connex*. The EIS also predicts that the level of service will improve at many intersections if nothing is done; in the case of Euston Rd/Sydney Park Rd, from D to A, in the pm peak. This is clearly ridiculous. It is so wrong that it suggests that the traffic modelling is either broken or more worryingly is corrupt (the EIS does acknowledge at least that the modelling is probably optimistic', and it suggests that the level of service on local roads will be several levels worse than predicted, either with or without the project.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston Road will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will only increase the damage done to the area and result in increased levels of rat-running.

Meanwhile, usage of the M5 is not growing, and has not grown for some years. This project only makes an existing road more expensive for commuters. It will save little time, if any, and at an exorbitant price. As the EIS acknowledges, the tolls are going to force drivers off the M5 and onto local roads. The Updated Strategic Business Case shows that for almost all of its users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using *West Connex*.

This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one of the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress. Sydney Park is a highly valued and heavily used amenity that is unique to the area. Reducing its amenity as a result of the *West Connex* and the levels of associated pollution (both fumes and noise) that will result is an unacceptable and ill-judged consequence of this planning decision. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in our area to help us cope with the massive rise in density that we are facing over the next ten years. I would be more than happy for a small portion of Sydney Park be sacrificed to a project to improve mass transit which would be a far cleaner and more cost-efficient use of the land. It would also benefit a far greater proportion of the population and would make an important contribution to minimising traffic emissions and thereby climate change.

I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the resultant traffic volumes that will occur in Alexandria, and there is also conflicting information on possible mitigation strategies. Although the diagrams in the EIS show right-hand turn lanes in all four directions at the Sydney Park Road/Euston Road intersection, the text about 'New M5 EIS Vol 2B App G Traffic and Transport' instead indicates that there will be a 'banned right turn from Mitchell Road into Sydney Park Road [because of] the banned right turn southbound at the Sydney Park Road/Euston Road intersection'. The text also indicates that there will be a 'north-bound lane [which] will go as far as Maddox Street, where it becomes a new left-hand turn lane, however the diagrams do not show this. Not having a clear understanding on which of these two scenarios is planned makes informed consultation impossible. If these right-hand turns into Sydney Park Road are not permitted, there will be enormous volumes of traffic on local roads as drivers try to rat run. Likewise, the extra left-hand turn lane, if it is actually planned, seems destined to drive traffic onto local roads.

Roads, especially tunnels, are expensive, and move relatively few people - perhaps 2,000 vehicles per hour per lane. This is a fraction of what can be moved by heavy rail, light rail or bicycles. Even pedestrians can move more commuters per lane than can be moved by car.

The EIS business case says that with toll roads 'losses to investors [are typical] due to traffic demand forecast being overly optimistic'. This has led to a situation in which it is likely the private sector sponsors will be unwilling [and the NSW Government is likely to have] to take on all or part of the development and start up traffic risk'. Why does the NSW government think that *West Connex* can be profitable when the private sector believes it cannot?

I call for the M5 EIS not to proceed. As a NSW taxpayer, I want better value for money and want to see a more visionary and environmentally responsible solution applied to this problem.

I have not ever made a reportable political donation.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Boyd', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**Associate Professor Mark Boyd** BA, BM, BS, MD, FRACP