

SSI 6788  
NSW Department of Planning and Environment  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

To the Minister for Planning

As residents of 9 Brown Street, St Peters since 2012 we strongly object to the entire WestConnex Project and ask you to reject the project on the basis of the inadequate Environmental Impact Statement and overall impact this project will have on the residences surrounding the M4 and M5 extension and St Peters Interchange. We are disappointed at the scale of the Project with the St Peters Interchange and Campbell Road upgrade being a huge monolith that will scar our neighbourhood aseptically and put hundred of thousands more cars and trucks each day onto local residential roads.

We do not feel that our rights are being considered and protected in regards to the predicted noise, aesthetics and pollution levels associated with the construction and operation of the WestConnex Project - M5 East St Peters Interchange and Campbell Street improvement. We purchased our first home at 9 Brown Street in 2012 and were excited about the prospect of living in a community with kids playing in the street and close to schools are activities. This response will consider specifically the St Peters Interchange and Campbell Street improvement due to our close proximity to Campbell Street. We have put in submissions opposing the entire WestConnex M4/M5 extensions.

We are extremely concerned about the impacts the project will have on our young family, with two children under 3 and the surrounding community. This includes local schools, parks and recreation facilities. We also have concerns that the EIS and project does not adequately cover the broader context of all likely affects on our home. We will be affected by a myriad of impacts at the same time including noise, dust, visual amenity, light pollution, additional traffic and gridlock. In addition we feel that our home has been markedly devalued as a result of this project.

## NOISE

### **Concern: Overall Noise Levels**

The EIS covers noise in a level of detail in Appendix J. It is of a high technical level and a failing of the EIS is the inability of the layperson to be able to interpret and make an accurate assessment of the impact of the road changes on their individual homes and families.

The predicted noise levels set out in Appendix J of the EIS are above the RMS Noise Mitigation Guide (NMG) 'acceptable criteria'. Our home is considered in *Table 6.1.10 Noise sensitive receivers eligible for consideration of additional noise mitigation*.

| ID   | Address                    | Use/Road category | L <sub>Aeq</sub> (9hour) noise level<br>dB(A) |       | Change<br>in noise<br>level<br>dB(A) |
|------|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|
|      |                            |                   | No Build                                      | Build |                                      |
| 3829 | 83 Church Street St Peters | Residential New   | 55                                            | 62    | 7.4                                  |
| 3831 | 9 Brown Street St Peters   | Residential New   | 53                                            | 62    | 8.7                                  |

The data above from Table 6.1.10 appears to be based on 2022 modelling. This puts us within the acute noise levels for night time. Acute level is 60dB(A) for 7pm-7am and 65dB(A) for daytime based on data from the RMS Noise Mitigation Guide (NMG). The change in noise level is substantial and will be noticeable around our home and community.

This puts us well above the World Health Organisation guidelines as stated in the RMS NMG. *Facade noise levels of 50dBA day and 45dBA night are considered representative of the World Health Organisation (WHO) Guidelines for Community Noise (1999) for outdoor areas and the WHO Night Noise Guidelines for Europe (2009) threshold levels.*

This causes serious concerns for the impacts on our home and our young children. The ability to live comfortably within our home without the annoyance of traffic is vital to us and the ability to utilise our outdoor space is also a matter to be considered. It has been well studied the negative effects of noise on personal well being and the overall community.

### **Concern: Noise Monitoring Data**

In regards to the actual monitoring data utilised by AECOM in the EIS, the noise monitoring stations were set up in a location away from our residence and may not have fully considered the impacts of the Campbell Road improvements on our actual home - both inside and outside. In addition, when you consider the ambient noise measurements set out in Appendix J Table 13 - the NL02 results (closest monitoring point) shows the rating of the Day at 50, Evening 46 and Night 39. Your modelling shows our base with no build at 53dB(A). If we were to take the monitoring data from NL02 LAeq, 9 hour compare this to the modelling table in 6.1.10 we are already above the level that the modelling suggested in Table 6.1.10.

| Noise logging location | Rating background level, dB(A)        |                                            |                                          | Ambient LAeq noise level, dB(A)     |                                         |                                       |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                        | Day<br>(7am to 6pm)<br>LA90,15 minute | Evening<br>(6pm to 10pm)<br>LA90,15 minute | Night<br>(10pm to 7am)<br>LA90,15 minute | Day<br>(7am to 6pm)<br>LAeq,15 hour | Evening<br>(6pm to 10pm)<br>LAeq,4 hour | Night<br>(10pm to 7am)<br>LAeq,9 hour |
|                        |                                       |                                            |                                          |                                     |                                         |                                       |
| NL01                   | 57                                    | 51                                         | 40                                       | 67                                  | 63                                      | 62                                    |
| NL02                   | 50                                    | 46                                         | 39                                       | 68                                  | 65                                      | 63                                    |
| NL03                   | 54                                    | 45                                         | 40                                       | 68                                  | 65                                      | 61                                    |

The report details that we will be exposed to levels above the acceptable criteria and the key mitigating measures to bring the levels of noise down are at the operational stage only. The only measure that has been proposed is the installation of architectural solutions. This is inadequate will not address the increased changes in noise to our residence that the project will result in.

### **Concern: Noise Monitoring Data Limitations**

The M5 EIS fails to sufficiently detail the dates that this study was done e.g. relevant to limitations with variations in traffic seen throughout the calendar year e.g. holidays, variations in other cumulative factors such as airport noise & wind at the time of logging.

In terms of effect on wind on the results the report failed to establish a reasonable attempt to obtain wind data. Rather than use the wind data from the airport which is "appreciably effected by wind" a subjective call was made to use a station at Canterbury. The use of such a point is not representative of monitoring points in St Peters. I am also concerned that wind data appears to be collected at the project monitoring station on the corner of Campbell and Princess Highway. Climatic monitoring clearly visible on the structure. Yet such data was not used, nor were any

attempts to put in place any climatic monitoring that would be more representative to the (relatively low number of ) baseline monitoring points.

The exclusion of “extraneous wind and rain” also biases results with both wind and rain having a strong influence on observed sound. As examples

- Low cloud cover associated with has an echoing effect on sound (increasing observed levels).
- Wind can either increase or decrease observed levels dependant on direction at the time of logging.

*M5 EIS- The Sydney Airport wind data was appreciably affected by wind, which was not considered to be characteristic of the St Peters area. On this basis, Canterbury weather data was used when considering the logger data. Periods which were affected by noise from extraneous wind and rain were omitted from the results.*

#### **How many days did the study take into account to come up with the base line data?**

It is well recognised that taking limited numbers & occurrences of samples results in statistically invalid results. If the data is limited as it appears to be this should be noted in the limitations of the study.

“In addition, logging was repeated at two locations during July/August/September 2015 due to earlier equipment failures”. The lack of detail surrounding this issue does not assure the reader that there was justification to discount the results for two locations.

#### **Current night time curfews on roads intersecting residential areas**

Importantly the night time measurements do not make any reference to current night time (after 10pm) curfews for heavy vehicles on Campbell Street. ie restricting the use of the road by heavy vehicles on roads such as Campbell Street (results graphed earlier in this section of the EIS for Campbell Street, so one can assume that one of these unidentified sample points represents such a scenario). Failing to take into account current curfews in the monitoring should be detailed as a limitation of the modelling - particularly if such curfews are potentially lifted. This highlights another deficiency in the EIS - there appears to be no reference to the future of current curfews which effectively impose respite periods for local residents from heavy traffic.

Is it proposed that these curfews remain in place? if not wouldn't the EIS be the spot to detail proposals to lift the current noise pollution controls?

#### **Concern: Ambient noise monitoring and deficiencies/limitations in the modelling**

We have concerns that the M5 EIS fails to adequately detail limitations & uncertainties with the baseline data & subsequent (attempts at) modelling the levels of sound during construction and during operation of the proposal. Noting such limitations and uncertainties is an accepted requirement in reporting ‘scientific data’ such as baseline noise assessments & modelling.

The RMS “Noise Mitigation Guideline” Section, 5.5 Design, reiterates such needs “Any limitations and modelling uncertainty in the EIA reports should be documented in the technical report”.

If this information is not accurate at the time of the Final EIS, critical irreversible decisions will be made that do not allow for future adjustments once the road is commissioned and further mitigation measures required. For Example: Failing to allow enough corridor space may result in a lack of buffer zone space to implement important mitigation options including noise barriers and in designing adequate corridor size to allow for one of the biggest influencing factors used in modelling- noise attenuation over distance. Highly effective mitigating measure.

## **Concern: lack of independent review of noise measurements, modelling and proposed mitigation measures**

As documented in the RMS - Noise mitigation guideline

*“Expert opinion in each particular area is helpful and for contentious locations the views of an independent expert are highly recommended. Quantitative information such as wind loading calculations, diagrams of site access, soil conditions, etc are needed to provide an objective basis.”*

The M5/ St Peters Interchange/Campbell Road widening is a contentious project with high media coverage. The location of the projects mean a very high numbers of the public effected by the increased levels of noise pollution.

The EIS Noise Component should be independently peer reviewed by technical experts to ensure the information, assumptions and data is accurate and considers all impacts of the project.

## **Concern: Noise Mitigation Measures - Operational**

We have concerns from the EIS in regards to the nose mitigation measures that have been considered but neither proposed not finalised. *“When designing noise mitigation, the target noise level is the lowest applicable noise criterion or controlling criterion, however it may not be feasible and reasonable to achieve these levels”.*

*Under the RMS Noise Mitigation Guidelines the principles to determine if noise mitigation is feasible and reasonable are:*

- 1. Communities should receive reasonable and equitable outcomes*
- 2. Noise mitigation should be designed to reduce noise levels to the criteria at qualifying receivers*
- 3. Priority should be first given to reducing noise during corridor planning and road design where there may be greater opportunity to provide cost effective and integrated outcomes with better urban design***
- 4. Following corridor and road design residual exceedences of noise criteria may be addressed at qualifying receivers using in order of preference (RMS Road Noise Policy Section 3.4.1) quieter road surfaces, barriers and at-property treatments*
- 5. Incidental benefits from the noise mitigation designed for qualifying receivers should be recognised at all receivers within a community where noise levels exceed WHO guidelines*

*In the EIS it was document that ‘A noise barrier was initially considered to the south of the proposed alignment. As access to properties and existing roads would need to be maintained, it would not be feasible to build noise barriers to mitigate the noise impacts. **It was also not considered reasonable to build a noise barrier to the north of Campbell Street due to visual amenity and other urban design aspects’.***

The EIS considers the RMS Noise Mitigation Guidelines Hierarchy of Controls for noise mitigation but does not activate the top order of quieter pavements, noise barriers, noise walls. The EIS seems to consider the last control options - at property treatment- as the only options. Why have the earlier options and the recommendations from the RMS website of control measures at source e.g. road surface, barriers and mounds not been **considered reasonable**? What are **other design aspects** that prevent at road mitigation and screening? The EIS does not adequately justify why these options were not considered. Stating that because the traffic is slow road (50km/hr) options are not suitable with no references.

There is a requirement in the RMS document to JUSTIFY all decisions and why the primary options were not considered. We do not feel that one sentence is adequate for a project of this size

and scope, nor just for our residences. This is a failing of the EIS and ultimately will impact on our residence, the community we live in and in the many individuals effected.

*The NSW EPA Road Noise Policy documents in 3.3.1, that a noise abatement measure is feasible if it can be engineered and is practical to build, given project constraints such as safety and maintenance requirements. **Control of transport noise at the source often involves modifying existing technology and practices that result in small but cumulatively significant reductions in generated noise.** Examples of such modifications include the use of low noise pavement surfaces or reductions in vehicle speed. Control of noise at the source is always the preferred method as it reduces the impact on the entire surrounding area. Noise path control or mitigation at the receiver end usually requires adopting measures such as barriers or at-property treatments that block the transmission of noise. As the benefit from these measures would only apply to a limited area, they should generally only be applied after endeavouring to control noise at the source.*

The best option would be to consider all controls together or a combination. We are strongly pushing for all considerations to be implemented - the first and priority to be the acquisition of more homes in the current road reservation to allow expansive noise mitigation options AND if future modelling and monitoring determine that the noise options that have been implemented are inadequate to allow for additional noise abatement measures e.g. noise barriers and mounds. The impact on the local community and residents should be the utmost priority to the project.

However, as shown in the map below inadequate buffer zone has been left at the Brown street section. Only one property (No. 1) is being acquired on the Northern side of the street



it is evident from the above image that this is not consistent with the surrounding streets where a larger buffer has been considered.

### **Concern: Noise Accumulation**

*As covered in the RTA Environmental Noise Management Manual 'there is a inverse relationship between sound intensity and distance. Noise from a point source such as an*

*individual vehicle will increase by 6dBa if the distance is halved. Similarly, if the distance is doubled the noise level will fall by 6dBa'.*

Noise attenuation has a significant impact in the planning options available for noise mitigation - i.e. in the design phase ensure that nearest houses are at an adequate distance to achieve the noise attenuation effect and compliance with acceptability criteria.

Other options should include noise reduction road surface, barriers, mounds and as a final resort residential architectural design options.

In addition, there is a lack of detail as to ANY noise mitigation measures (the EIS stating it has limited availability of options) that will be installed in the vicinity of Brown Street. There had been mention at WestConnex face-to-face meetings of a cul-de-sac for Brown and Florence Streets with a barrier along Campbell Road. Why is this not an option? By commissioning top order noise mitigation options the impact from Campbell Road would be minimised as much as possible.

### **Concern: Noise Mitigation Measures at Residential Receivers**

*M5 EIS - Covered under 8.2 St Peters Interchange, based on the results covered in 6.1 a total of 144 residential receivers were identified as eligible for consideration of additional noise mitigation measures. In addition two buildings within St Peters Public School are likely to experience noise levels which exceed the internal noise criteria with windows open.*

*Due to the limited availability of noise mitigation options, 144 residential receivers would continue to have residual noise levels above the controlling criterion. These receivers would be eligible for the consideration of at-property treatments to achieve compliance with the applicable noise goals. This should be subject to confirmation during detailed design.*

In regard to the above paragraph from the EIS, simply dealing with the residential receivers via architectural treatment does not alleviate the impacts on the entire community, local streets and local parks including Simpson Park on Campbell Street and Camdenville Park or our personal outdoor living space. We do not want to live in a closed box where we are unable to open the windows and doors due to the noise. Also, there is no consideration of the St Peters pre-school where young children aged 3-5 are located. Our eldest child attends this pre-school It is imperative that the entire St Peters school AND pre-school are considered also for noise mitigation measures, not just two buildings with 'windows open'.

### **Concern: Failure to comply with community safeguards**

The M5 EIS fails to adequately consider community safeguards put in place by NSW Government State Agencies including the NSW EPA Road Noise Policy and RMS Noise Mitigation Guidelines. These guidelines have been developed to protect the community and should be adhered to at all times including state significant developments. This is a significant failing of the EIS.

### **Concern: Parallel Routes Assessment**

The EIS has also failed to consider noise measurements outside an 'arbitrary study' area selected by the proponent. The requirements have been clearly set out by the RMS and are referred to in the EIS:

#### ***EIS - 6.1.11 Parallel routes assessment***

*As a result of the project it is likely that traffic would be redistributed across the local road network. This has the potential to have a road traffic noise impact on receivers located on parallel routes. These routes comprise roads which have not been considered as project roads. The Noise Criteria Guideline considers any project to be a traffic generating*

development if it is predicted to increase noise levels by greater than 2.0 dB(A) on any other road. Therefore an assessment of the potential impacts is required.

### EIS - 9.2.3 Parallel routes

*In accordance with the Roads and Maritime's Noise Criteria Guideline, to be considered a traffic generating development (which would require further consideration of mitigation measures) the road would need to increase noise levels by more than 2.0 dB(A). The impact has been considered to be minor and would not appreciably impact other routes.*

This parallel route assessment has not been considered in the EIS and there is no apparent justification for this being omitted. There appears to be no further studies of the impacts on surrounding local roads past Campbell Street - this includes Edgware Road, Unwins Bridge Road, May Street and a myriad of other streets that will become 'rat runs'.

Rather the EIS states that the requirement was "considered and would not appreciably impact on other routes". The properties whereby this community safeguard applies is very straight forward and prescriptive as set out by the RMS- where the predicted increase in noise levels as a result of the project is greater than 2.0 dB. This is not a subjective guideline.

Westconnex was contacted (28/1/2016) to assist in the clarification of the noise assessment and details of roads outside of the noise assessment considerations in the EIS report. After a detailed discussion it was brought to my attention that the red line on the maps in the EIS is an arbitrary line defined by Westconnex that defines the study area and (supposed) responsibility limits.

The key to the aerial photo/map below (apparently incorrectly) states that the red line defines "Highly urban areas". Source: EIS numerous maps (Appendix F).



There appears to be 2 significant issues with the key to this map and adherence to the policy:

**Issue 1:** The Area labeled "Highly Urban" is not as would be expected by definition highly built up areas. Rather, it defines the area that Westconnex (selected by person) consider the boundary of responsibility for the project (confirmed in phone conversation today) and the area of impact from Campbell Street.

The orange colour associated with an increase of 2dB is all within this defined Westconnex boundary. This is no coincidence and outside of this defined project boundary, there is obviously a

lack of data or modelling to even consider the very likely increase of whether the 2 dB that would occur as a result of this roadworks. The Westconnex 'perceived' responsibility boundary should be extended in a much greater area than what is currently displayed and reported on.

**Issue 2:** The Blue colour indicates that for the houses "Project does not contribute to 2.0 decibels or more". It appears that this statement /key is incorrect. Even property labeled 3364 and 3368 in the wedge at the greatest distance from the road changes are indicated to have an impact of > 2.0 dB BUT the properties much closer to the road with no detailed noise mitigation study or outside of the area of perceived responsibility are in blue - indicating no increase in noise. Once again, this is no coincidence. It appears no modelling has been done on the properties outside of the red zone to determine if there would be an increase or not.

It is difficult to see how a decision was made on where the red line ends (the study area) and responsibility ceases. Peruse over the maps detailed in section F and you will see many examples where it is hard to fathom how neighbouring houses or roads are not seen to have an increase of 2.0 dB. At a minimum the EIS should have carried out further due diligence to investigate and report on the potential and the findings. Obviously, the project roads should be expanded to include a larger number of local roads rather than the small sample that WestConnex consider are affected by the project. It would appear that the areas where a 'high level' of noise is already assumed will not be further investigated. However, the requirement from the guidelines clearly state it is the change in decibels rather than actual levels.

An easy example of where there appears to be critical errors on the numerous maps (Appendix J Sub-Appendix F) that "Project contributes 2.0 db or less" the is seen in the residences and roads adjacent to our home in Brown Street. **The predicted change in noise is 8.7 decibels at our residence** (coloured orange in the map).

The predicted noise levels set out in Appendix J of the EIS are above the RMS Noise Mitigation Guide (NMG) 'acceptable criteria'. Our home is considered in *Table 6.1.10 Noise sensitive receivers eligible for consideration of additional noise mitigation*.

| ID   | Address                    | Use/Road category | L <sub>Aeq</sub> (9hour) noise level dB(A) |       | Change in noise level dB(A) |
|------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|
|      |                            |                   | No Build                                   | Build |                             |
| 3829 | 83 Church Street St Peters | Residential New   | 55                                         | 62    | 7.4                         |
| 3831 | 9 Brown Street St Peters   | Residential New   | 53                                         | 62    | 8.7                         |

The Town and Country Hotel is our direct rear boundary neighbours and their facade is on the corner of May and Campbell Street. They fall outside the red line and (supposedly) according to the key, do not have a predicted increase of 2.0 dB. This is well below the 8.7 dB change our residence is predicted to have. Note that there are no noise mitigation measures detailed between the two properties and they are very closely located. In questioning this example with Westconnex staff on 28/1/2016, I was informed that they fell outside the study area red line on map above and (supposed) responsibility area.

This is one example of failure to adequately address the requirement and the same issue can be seen on a larger scale across many roads and communities within the Technical working Paper on Noise and Vibration. The implication is that there is a gross under reporting in this respect & a failure to consider the residents in the affected areas.

This should not be an arbitrary line drawn up by Westconnex whereby hands are wiped and responsibility ends. Rather the study area should be driven by safeguards such as those built into the RMS Guidelines. As a member of the wider community effected by the project I am very concerned that such safeguards could be eroded.

A broader example of concern- Edgware Road. This roads would significantly increase the application of the RMS guideline and requirement for inclusion in this report under **M5 EIS 9.2.3 Parallel routes**. I believe that it is not unreasonable to require an investigation to run a predicted noise increase model based on the very likely increases in traffic on this road as a result of the project.

#### Concern: Construction noise and vibration

The project construction phase will cause an increase in noise and vibration at our residence. As the parents of two small children, the noise and vibration will have detrimental affect on our well being and quality of life. We are concerned that there are not adequate mitigation measures in place to minimise this and feel the massive works required are inappropriate for a community such as St Peters. We believe our home should have noise and vibration mitigation measures in place during construction and operation. It is simply bad practice to consider mitigation measures after the construction phase.

There is growing scientific evidence that even in the short term, high levels of noise and vibration will cause long term health impacts.

## VISUAL IMPACTS AND URBAN DESIGN

#### Concern: Light Pollution

The building of the St Peters Interchange and upgrade to Campbell Road will result in additional signage, traffic lighting and street lighting.

The EIS does not adequately cover the consideration of increases in light pollution on our street and residence. There will be an obvious 'light glow' around the upgraded road. We currently sight our neighbours and other properties but if all the acquired properties are demolished, it will leave an obvious gap where the oncoming traffic movements will sight directly into our front of house.

Campbell Road is currently in darkness during night hours except for minimal low impact lighting. The new road will require extensive bright lights which will directly impact on our residence.

#### Concern: Visual Amenity

Under chapter 14.3 of the M5 EIS,

*Road upgrades to the land surrounding the St Peters interchange include widening of Campbell Road, Campbell Street and Euston Road, as well as new bridges spanning the Alexandra Canal and adjoining Campbell Road and Gardeners Road. The widening of Campbell Road and Campbell Street would contribute to visually significant character changes within these road corridors. Where the widened road passes through land zoned SP2 Infrastructure, B4 Mixed Use and IN2 Light industrial, the change in character would be in keeping with the desire to 'maintain access and connectivity between local centres of employment and economic activity'. Where the road widening passes through land zoned RE2 Low Density Residential and adjacent to RE1 Public Recreation (ie Campbell Street), the character of the new road is consistent with the nature of this area as a road reserve in a residential area.*

This is completely unacceptable to state that the because we currently live in a road reserve that the new Campbell Road widening will be consistent with the current situation. Campbell Road is currently two lanes and has peak periods AM and PM but the remainder of the time is a relatively quiet street. The changes to Campbell Road will increase traffic movements at all times of the day and night and change the local street feel that Campbell Road currently has. The removal of the buffering homes in the street effectively reduces the road reserve and we become the new closest edge of the reserve rather than part of an entire road reserve system. Again, we request the opportunity for WestConnex to acquire a greater number of homes in the road reserve that has currently been acquired.

Table 14.15 of the EIS demonstrates the the Campbell Road upgrade between Unwins Bridge Road and Princes Highway have a high sensitivity of receivers and the magnitude of change will be moderate. We disagree that the change will be moderate. Upgrade from a two lane road with peak periods, slow speeds and overnight truck restrictions to a six lane road is not moderate. Nor does it factor in the removal the buffer homes that we currently enjoy. The project will require the demolition of up to 4 homes on the southern side of Brown Street - increasing our sensitivity from your estimation of 'moderate' to high impact. In addition our access to Simpson Park will be untenable with prams and bikes.

#### Concern: Destruction of Greenspace

The St Peters Interchange and Campbell Road widening will destroy existing greenspace in Sydney Park, existing street trees and the beautiful old Banksia trees in the reserve on the corner of May and Campbell Roads. This will remove areas for residents and communities to utilise. The recent stormwater infrastructure project in Sydney Park has created an amazing open space parkland and it seems incredulous that in 2016, the NSW Government to be removing hard won greenspace. Greenspace is vital for all cities and for Sydney to remain a healthy vital city outdoor areas must be made available to its residents.

The destruction of large parts of Camdenville Park for construction zones will render Marrickville Councils plans for a children's bike track and play area null and void. This is a much needed addition to the inner west and replacing this with parking areas and construction zones is unacceptable. The park is a well utilised green space within this part of St Peters - both recreational and for sporting events.

#### Concern: Loss of Public Amenity in St Peters

The St Peters Interchange and Campbell Road widening will change the entire look and community feel of St Peters at a time when St Petes is undergoing massive positive gentrification. The improvements and property boom of a suburb so close to the city and walking distance of the vibrant suburb of Newtown should not be ignored. It has a reliable and extensive public transport system and a huge tollways splitting the suburb in two will not help in the ongoing improvement of the suburb.

### **SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC**

#### Concern: The Social Impacts of a large scale project.

The St Peters Interchange and more directly the Campbell Road widening will have a huge, unknown toll on our family and neighbours. The EIS is inadequate in its considering of the social impacts of the project and we certainly have not been contacted for a formal survey as part of the economic and social component of the EIS. We assume it is another generic document that is created using WestConnex assumptions and other road projects.

There will be significant stress and psychological impact on ourselves and residents due to a loss of community, homes, amenity and most importantly the impact of living with years of demolition,

construction and commission works. There will also be a cumulative effect of all the changes on ourselves and children with minimal means of mitigation for these cumulative social impacts.

#### Concern: Devaluation of Property

Despite property values being branded a 'temporary nature' in AECOMS Social and Economic Impact Study, we have grave concerns for the devaluing of our property as a result of the Campbell Road widening. The proximity to a large road will have negative impacts on our home and its value. IN addition, we must also put any improvements, renovations or selling that we had considered on hold until after the project has opened. This is a incredible amount of time for us to see what the future of this project looks like.

### AIR QUALITY

#### Concern: Air Pollution

We are concerned that the Campbell Road widening will be a significant contributor to overall pollution levels in St Peters and in particularly around our home. Living close to busy roads is a health risk and the increases in car numbers in this area will cause an increase in air and dust pollution. There is strong scientific evidence that air pollution, especially PM 2.5 and PM 10 are linked to increased risks lung disease, impaired lung development, strokes, cancer and other forms of respiratory illness. The EIS acknowledges that Campbell Road, St Peters Interchange and other local roads will become more utilised and therefore by default more polluted. In some cases, air pollution is already at unhealthy level. The acquisition of properties in St Peters has reduced the impact boundaries and we are considered an the edge of the project works. It would be advisable to acquire additional properties and put in mitigation measures including green spaces to reduce the impacts of air pollution on local residences.

We have grave concerns that Leightons/CIMIC, who have been awarded the contract before approval, decided that ventilation stacks should not be filtered although tollway projects in other countries have ventilation stacks which filter emissions. The EIS asserts that there will be very low 'negligible' emissions in local areas from the stacks'. One reason engineers give for filtering tunnels is to protect residents in high buildings or land. In this project, some residents live on hills and others (e.g. in Arncliffe) live in high buildings. There are experts who say that stack emissions are not safe and should be filtered. We are well within the drop zone for these unfiltered tunnels and are concerned about the increases in air pollution on our place of residence and local schools and parks.

The increases in traffic will spill over into other roads and streets but because the traffic modelling only extends to two intersections past the boundaries of the Westconnex project, these increased air pollution levels have not been modelled or presented in the EIS. This was also a factor discussed in the noise modelling part of the EIS.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. We have already seen that the traffic impacts of the New M5 are extremely uncertain. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments cannot be regarded as reliable.

### WESTCONNEX PROJECT

We object to the entire WestConnex Project for a number of important reasons:

- The WestConnex Project and Sydney Motorway Corporation lacks transparency and is not accountable to the NSW taxpayers. There has been no thorough business case released to the

public. There have been minimal studies of alternatives including a public transport system or freight by rail. Alternatives would be a better investment of \$16.8Billion.

- The EIS fails to nominate who is independently reviewing the project in all aspects.
- Impacts on local traffic surrounding the St Peters Interchange. Traffic in St Peters, Enmore, Tempe, Sydenham and Newtown will increase as a result of the project with more cars spilling on to local residential roads.
- Evidence has shown the building bigger and more roads does not alleviate traffic congestion but causes additional movements leading to further connection 'cars hold up traffic'.
- The M4/M5 Projects will require hefty toll increases to fund the project. Not only will this put pressure on local tax payers but also create rat runs through local streets to avoid tolls.
- The St Peters Interchange will cause a large increase in particulate pollution and risk to human health but increase in traffic movements and increases on local residential roads. This is unacceptable to place the residents of St Peters at high risk. Local schools and child care centres will also be impacted by increases in traffic movements. It is imperative that alternative solutions are considered including a mass transit system.
- The incredible expense and waste of tax payers money in not only acquiring Alexandria Landfill from Dial-a-Dump but compensating Mr Malouf for the privilege. Regardless of the contamination of the site the cost of remediation is simply a drain of the tax payers of NSW.
- There must be a NSW Upper House Inquiry and Auditor Generals review of the EIS process.

As a local resident, rate payer and tax payer I ask that my objection to the M5 extension and St Peters Interchange be recorded. I ask that our objections are properly considered and understand that the Department of Planning will publish our name and submission on the website. Please reply directly to my submission and not send us a generic response. This will not be accepted. I have not given more than \$1000 to any political party.

Elissa Bishop and Samuel Prisk  
9 Brown Street  
St Peters  
NSW 2044