

"Glenhope"
113 Castle Hill Road
West Pennant Hills
NSW 2125
Ph 9634 2508

The Director
Major Projects Assessment,
Department of Planning and Infrastructure,
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir

Re: North West Rail EIS 1

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the EIS for the major construction works for this major project.

Firstly I would like to say I am in support of the project.

I am by no means an expert in the matters discussed in the documents made available and the numbers in most cases do not mean much to me. My comments are made from the viewpoint of an ordinary citizen who lives opposite one of the major construction sites. In many cases I have great concern about what is **not said** rather than what is actually stated in the EIS.

My comments relate specifically to the proposed **Cherrybrook Station** site.

1. Can I suggest that this new name for the station is completely inappropriate and misleading. The Cherrybrook shopping centre is more than 2km away from the proposed station. By naming the station Cherrybrook, there will be an expectation that you will arrive at Cherrybrook town centre when in reality you will be far from the town centre. Since there is no present town centre near the proposed station I would suggest some "neutral" name should be used and nominate Cumberland Forest as a starting point in the discussion.
2. I note that there will be major construction happening across the road for more than 2 years and it would appear this time frame is based on using only 1 TBM to do both tunnels to Epping. The impact of noise, traffic, vibration, dust on our property and our total lifestyle could be significantly reduced if the construction period was reduced by using more than 1 TBM. It is requested that part of the planning to reduce the environmental impact of this project include the requirement to condense the construction period.
3. Section 9.4 discusses construction traffic and the potential impacts. The tables show that there are likely to be more than 880 truck movements per day for at least 2 years but it does not say how this will impact on nearby residents and their daily lives. Has any effort been made to "share" this burden by using additional construction sites?

Will any conditions be placed on the noise each truck generates ? We all know that some trucks are much quieter than others. And trucks towing empty trailers make lots of noise. How will this be managed and what remedies will be available to residents.

4. I note that some noise meters have done some measurements in our vicinity but the numbers produced mean nothing to me and the various thresholds are similarly meaningless. The EIS does not give any process for rectification of noisy operations across the road. It just says that various limits will be set and that's it ! I would like the EIS to nominate processes which must be followed to rectify breaches so we can comment also

on the processes.

5. In relation to noise, Table 10.3 implies that very noise work will be able to continue, regardless of the levels, so long as neighbours have been informed. There is no protection to the community or environment in "controls" like this. We need more specific assurances that certain noise levels will not be exceeded – ever !
6. My reading of clause 10.7.4 suggests that there will be no increase in noise levels due to night time spoil removal. Surely if there are 20 or 30 movements every hour there will be more noise. Is this an error ?
7. Figure 10.4 shows the location of noise meters used to measure existing background noise and then provide the basis for comment on the effect of construction noise on surrounding properties. However, this location was related to the earlier tunnel location. The current design for the line shows the tunnel and station much closer to Castle Hill Road and I believe the resultant noise impact on my property must be greater than reported in the tables.
8. I am concerned that the large area of grass in front of our property will be used for parking, given that there will be limited on site parking. The EIS identifies that there will be a need to restrict parking in nearby Glenhope Road but is silent on whether or not there will also be restrictions in front of our property. I will insist that our street frontage be protected from any impact from the railway construction works.
9. In Table 9.15 Item T5 it states that access to properties will be maintained. Does this mean that existing levels of access will be maintained to my property during the construction period? That is, will I still be able to turn right into my driveway from Castle Hill Road ?
10. At the invitation of the people at the Community Information Centre in Castle Hill, I attended a briefing by the noise and vibration consultants. I can only say that I came away unconvinced that there would be no affect to my house. As recorded in the EIS, "Glenhope" is heritage listed, in part for the intact interior finishes which include fragile lath and plaster walls and ceilings. What assurances can you give me that my property will not be damaged by the operations across the road ? And what undertakings regarding reinstatement can be given ?
11. I note that it is proposed to provide screening up to 6 metres high for the site but that The Hills Shire Council's submission is concerned that that height is too high. I would want the screen to be as high as is absolutely possible. We will be significantly impacted by the noise, dust and lighting from the site and will need all the screening possible.

This also means the retention of the significant stand of trees along the Castle Hill Road frontage at least until construction has finished. They will be extremely effective in trapping dust and light spill from the site.

So in summary, I understand that there will be some impacts from such a major undertaking, but I would suggest that there is a need to provide greater assurances to affected residents that these impacts will be properly managed and that we will have access to senior management to have matters resolved quickly. I look forward to your comments.

Yours faithfully



Keith Stapley