

1087. Illegible

Form type L1.

1088. JOHNSON Helen

Form type L1.

1089. JOHNSON Belinda

Form type L1.

1090. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1091. DRIELS Ronald

Form type L1

1092. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1093. OLIVEIRA Luis

Form type L1

1094. RECER Deanne

Form type M1

1095. BATCHELOR John

Form type L4

1096. HILL Peter

Form type L4

1097. BURGESS Kerrie

Form type L4

1098. HARRINGTON Matt

Form type L

1099. LEE T.

Form type L

1100. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M

- The loss of 3 acres of park land and open space to accommodate the motorway is unacceptable.
- Access to and use of parklands will be impeded in the areas of Surry Hills, Redfern and Woolloomooloo, which do not have adequate green space within residential areas.
- Should the Eastern Distributor proceed it must be underground with tunnelling from the Domain Tunnel to Link Road, Kensington.
- Concerned about the adverse effect on the numerous items of heritage significance along the route.
- Carcinogenic benzene concentrations and other pollutants will increase over residential areas.
- The large scale configuration and visual ugliness of what is proposed for South Dowling St is unacceptable. The toll road will be up to 10 lanes wide in many sections with differing elevations and cuttings.
- The poor design will degrade the appearance of the inner city, specifically Surry Hills, Moore Park and Redfern as the entrance to the City of Sydney.
- Elevated roadways will overshadow the Art Gallery and historic Woolloomooloo. This will be visually disruptive and greatly reduce opportunities to have access to the City's open space areas.
- Night time traffic noise is already a serious problem.
- Noise levels already exceed WHO standards by over 40db.
- Increase in truck movements from Port Botany and the M5 will further affect what is in many cases an already impossible situation.
- Toll avoiders will adversely affect communities alongside the distributor corridor by using local streets This includes William and Ocean Streets.
- There is a lack of Local Area Traffic Management plans within the EIS process to allow the community to assess the effects of the proposed distributor on local traffic management.
- East West traffic including that generated by the Sydney Football Stadium, Sydney Cricket Ground and FOX studios has not been given due consideration.

- Communities affected by the proposal have not had sufficient consultation nor access to various data during the pre-consultation process.
- Inducement of traffic to the route due to its connection to the completed M5 motorway will result in an estimated increase of traffic of 250% within metres from heritage residential areas.
- The proposal will create gridlock around Drivers Triangle unless it is redesigned completely to separate east-west traffic from north-south traffic

1101. GILL James R.W.

Form type M

1102. PRIOR Andrew

Form type M

1103. WILSON R.M.

Form type M

1104. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M

1105. COUTEUR M.G.

Form type M

1106. LITTLE

Form type M

1107. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M

1108. JONES Michael

Form type M

1109. KENNEDY Arthur John

Form type M

1110. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M

1111. BERLYN N.R.B.

Form type M

1112. BERLYN J.E.

Form type M

1113. MACARTHUR George

Form type M

1114. GREEN J.

Form type M

1115. CUFFMAN Paul

Form type M

1116. LENDRUM David

Form type M

1117. LARCOMBE L.

Form type M

1118. AITKEN P.N.

Form type M

1119. AITKEN Felicity

Form type M

1120. AITKEN J.S.

Form type M

1121. AITKEN David

Form type M

1122. WILSON R.M.

Form type M

1123. WILSON M.M.

Form type M

1124. WILSON W.M.

Form type M

1125. CROZIER Nicole

Form type C1

1126. SAINTY Fiona

Form type C1

1127. LEWIS Maggie

Form type C1

1128. GIBBONS Ian

Form type C1

1129. MORSLEY C

Form type C1

1130. PELLATT Dowing

Form type C1

1131. ENDERSBEE E

Form type C1

1132. BROWN Donna B

Form type C1

1133. ROBERTSON Sophy

Form type C1

1134. FRIEDMAN Jack

Form type C1

1135. FARRUGIA L Mr

Form type C1

1136. TOMLIN David

Form type C1

1137. WHITE A

Form type C1

1138. GILLAM Roma and PETTINGELL William

- The current proposal will adversely effect Moore Park.
- The visual impact of a ten lane toll road with complex intersections will sever the South Dowling Street/Moore Park relationship. This would be an eyesore that Sydney should avoid.
- Local traffic will be at risk with the chance of accidents increasing with interaction of traffic at Cleveland street.
- The current proposal for Woolloomooloo and the intersection at Drivers Triangle are unacceptable on the grounds of social amenity and visual impact. The current design will have adverse effects on Sydney as a whole.
- Should the project proceed, consideration should be given to placing the toll road in an underground tunnel. This approach should be adopted instead of trying to undertake a bare minimum of work to complete the work.

1139. MOSS Peter

- The proposal would modify important vistas in the city centre. It will lead to the destruction of important city vistas such as the Opera House and Art Gallery. This will adversely impact upon morale and self esteem of the community as well as diminishing tourist potential.
- The RTA's approach to planning roads, to solve congestion, only leads to more congestion. Professor Blunden of UNSW Department of Transport states that bottle-necks are simply moved somewhere else when new roads are constructed.
- The RTA promotes a cycle of new roads leading to more car use. This leads to a need for more roads. The RTA is self serving and negative.
- The RTA should view congestion as the only practical mechanism which will prompt people to abandon the use of cars for public transport.

- Concerned that the proposal will impact upon the quality of life.
- It is unclear why 10 lanes are needed when connection roads such as the Harbour Tunnel to South Dowling Street, are 2 lanes in each direction, as is General Homes Drive.
- Public transport projects have been shelved.
- Heavy and light rail solutions should be given precedence.
- The Eastern Distributor would destroy provisions for light rail.
- Roads are very expensive and a drain on the public purse due to tolls, car maintenance, and accidents. Governments should allow railways to shape city development.
- Roads are a social trap based on perceptions of comfort and cost saving. Improved public transport is required to counter this argument. More roads will confound the necessary social changes.
- Government intervention is required to encourage public transport over free market forces.
- Concerned that the road will use part of the Eastern Suburbs light rail corridor which is vandalism and supports a non-sustainable car culture.

1140. WEBB Leta

- The proposal acknowledges adverse impacts on many local streets and attempts to bypass the toll booths will provide a greater impact on local streets
- The EIS does not consider that buses need to go between destinations and not be diverted through the tunnel at William Street and into the city. This disadvantages commuters from south eastern Sydney travelling to the south of Sydney.
- The removal of a bus lane in Moore Park is likely to slow buses from the south eastern suburbs.
- The proposal focuses on north/south efficiency not on the efficiency of people that live, work and recreate in the area.
- There will be considerable traffic delays which is unacceptable during construction.
- The proponent should negotiate for public transport services during the construction period.
- South Dowling Street is already efficient and traffic demand is limited so why extend the *status quo*?

- Tables on projected demand show higher traffic levels when demand is low compared to lower traffic levels during periods of high demand.
- Congestion in some South Sydney streets has resulted due to the Harbour Tunnel.
- The EIS should have commitments by governments of all levels to reduce motor vehicle dependency and demand.
- The EIS should have evaluated demand in relation to increases in oil prices.
- Traffic demand discounting would not eventuate if the road was not built or built on a more modest scale.
- The proposal is in direct competition to the New Southern Rail and is likely to have a negative effect.
- There is no proposal to divert heavy vehicles to the Eastern Distributor so the roadway is not relevant to the need of the proposal. The EIS forecasts an increase of 50% of freight by the year 2011.
- The ease of access and flat terrain is ideal for public service, greater use of cycles and for walking.
- Bicycles need to be considered more with attention to where people live and where they want to go.
- The proposal offers no solution to the adverse impact on cycling and walking. In relation to bikeways the responsibility is passed onto the Local Council .
- The Eastern Distributor is a huge barrier which cuts off people from places that they want to travel to.
- The elderly, children and disabled will have limited access across South Dowling Street.
- Concerned that proposal will have an effect on the quality of life of nearby residents.

1141. SAMEK Peter

- Ridge Street is one of the last remaining unaltered terraced streets in Surry Hills and needs to be protected from increased and unprotected traffic flows
- The proposal will impede upon insufficient parking along Ridge, Mort, Cleveland and South Dowling Streets because of a "need" for increased smoother traffic flows.
- Ridge Street is particularly narrow for parking on both sides of Street

- Design and elevations of the proposal at the end of Ridge and Mort Streets is an eyesore and ugly. This proposal is outdated by at least 30 years.
- The design of footpaths on Ridge Street is too narrow and forces pedestrians to use the street
- People wishing to avoid traffic delays in Cleveland Street will use Ridge Street
- A high volume of traffic will enter Ridge Street to travel north. This is assuming traffic will travel south down Riley, Crown and Bourke Streets and west down Devonshire Street.
- There is no Local Area Traffic Management to assess the impact of the Distributor.
- The proposal will destroy the quality of life in the inner city and necessitate an exodus back to the outer regions of Sydney.
- The proposal appears more concerned with the motorists view rather than the rights of the local community to experience and enjoy their park.
- Counter to the EIS, pedestrian access is relatively safe along South Dowling Street. The proposal will severely impede both residential and transient population pedestrian movement..
- Increased traffic on South Dowling Street and Cleveland Street will adversely affect residents.
- The design of the motorway near Cleveland Street with dramatic tunnel elevations will further exaggerate noise as it travels down Ridge street The noise impacts will be detrimental to the learning and teaching environment of the nearby school.
- Noise will travel down Ridge street and it is disputed that the increases in noise will be below 3dB(a).
- The conclusions reached in Working Paper 4 that noise will only increase by 2 dB(A) for this zone has been assessed on measurement and modelling for 3 specific locations. Current noise levels were measured at 20 locations. Two of the monitoring stations are projected to be where underpasses has been proposed. This will incorrectly reflect projected noise for the area.
- The noise impact already exceeds WHO standards and those of the RTA.
- 41,00 trucks and their exhaust is unaccounted for in the proposal and that the trucks will travel through high density residential areas. This is a serious and major health concern to the local community.
- Concerned about traffic emitting carcinogenic benzene, especially for children at Bourke Street Public School. Traffic lights at South Dowling and Bourke Streets will not allow

free flowing traffic and thus emissions will not be reduced. To argue otherwise in the proposal is incorrect.

- Believes that estimates for Cleveland Street are incorrect due to the impacts of traffic and emissions from Fox Studios and Randwick Racecourse. The increased traffic from Cleveland Street and South Dowling Street will adversely effect the local community.
- The Eastern Distributor should be placed underground from the Domain Tunnel to Link Road Kensington.

1142. DONATTI Christina

- The submission seeks to ensure that the proposal does not impact upon the development potential of the sites (11 - 25 and 27 - 51 Palmer Street, Woolloomooloo) and the on-going operation of associated commercial uses. A requirement for all traffic to travel north would undermine the viability of the showrooms and reduce the commercial value of the residential units to be erected and cause significant financial loss.
- The visual impact of the development is of considerable concern. Exposure is considered paramount to the ongoing commercial use of the sites as showrooms. Such exposure will be adversely affected if the carriageway is elevated and concrete barricades erected.
- In terms of social impact, the future residential use of the sites is not addressed. Greater consideration within the EIS is recommended to consider the impact of the new road upon the social profile of future residential and employment opportunities. Works will involve demolition of commercial premises, a park and 13 terraced houses on the eastern side of Palmer Street. There is a likelihood that asbestos will be present in some of the buildings to be demolished. The removal of asbestos is time consuming and is likely to result in long term demolition works directly opposite the sites. The visual and social impact of these works upon the future use of the sites has not been addressed in the EIS.
- Advice has been sought on the economic impact of the roadway, and in addition loss of rent, and payment of rates, each lessee estimates an immediate loss of between \$300,000.00 - \$400,000.00 once construction commences. A continuous loss of approximately \$750,000.00 per annum (the annual net turnover of both tenants is \$1.5 million) is estimated for the duration of the construction of the Expressway. A compensatory measure which should be seriously considered by the RTA is the closure of the sites during the period of construction of the Expressway and proper compensation for that period of closure representing rent, rates, loss of amenity and loss of profits. In addition the occupiers should be offered a capital compensation of \$3,500,000.
- The EIS does not acknowledge any economic impact upon the sites, either in their use as showrooms or with regards to the existing development consent for residential units. The sites are noted as being the closest commercial buildings adjoining part of the length of the Expressway and the development and will therefore have serious economic impact. Uncertainty caused by the proposal for a temporary period may restrict the sale of properties during planning and construction. There have been significant costs associated

with the delayed use of the sites and foregone investment opportunities. Economic impact is a reasonable concern in the assessment of the road's effect upon the area.

- The EIS should determine actual impacts. There seems to be several areas where the details are either not provided or have not been fully investigated in terms of future land use opportunities, physical detailing of works, programming of stages of construction, access to the sites, impacts upon commercial activities and final product. Avenues of compensation to address potential economic impacts have not been considered in any detail.
- A community liaison group will be established prior to the commencement of detailed designs and before commencement of construction. There will be further public displays and a process for complaints. There is no reference as to who will be a part of this group.
- The RTA noise level objectives would be exceeded in the area in question. In this regard, the RTA has a responsibility to ensure that the future amenity of the site is safeguarded, in light of future noise increases. Physical obstructions between the sites and the road would detract from commercial opportunities on the sites. Alternative solutions should be investigated and mitigating and/or compensation measures considered.
- There will be significant movement of construction traffic between the site compounds. The activity associated with the period of construction is likely to undermine the viability of the proposed showroom and existing car storage uses, as well as deter investment in the redevelopment proposal. This would cause significant financial loss in terms of either lost or delayed income.
- The vibrations caused by excavation works, demolition of adjacent buildings and by the increased volume of traffic in the long-term are real concerns. A dilapidation survey should be carried out prior to the commencement of any associated roadworks. The survey should be internal and external.
- The redirection of traffic onto the south side of Palmer Street will reduce the exposure of the sites to existing traffic flows. It could potentially result in the obstruction of access from William Street into the sites during this period. Access from Palmer Street will be heavily restricted, if not impossible yet this is the only access available to the site 27 - 51 Palmer Street as provided in the Development Approval. Measures should be prepared to ensure full access to the sites, otherwise there is the potential to cause physical inconvenience, substantial financial harm and safety hazards.
- Safe access to the sites via Palmer Street is essential, as this is the only access available due to the development approval obtained.
- Daily dust emissions at times will be in the order of 129.2 kilograms per day. Dust is likely to obscure all windows to the buildings on the site, layer visitor vehicles in the carpark and intrude into the showrooms and possibly damage those vehicles for sale and on display. Measures should be put in place to ensure that all windows to the buildings are cleaned daily, including adequate protection for vehicles parked in the open air and that

appropriate steps are taken to prevent dust intrusion into the showrooms. If the dust cannot be controlled adequately, work should cease in adverse conditions.

- Details of where Crown Street may become only one lane in each direction is requested as this proposal could impact upon the western egress from the sites via Bossley Terrace. Reduced width roadway could result in unnecessary traffic jams on Crown Street and Bossely Terrace. It is suggested that the lower section of Crown Street , between William Street and Sir John Young Crescent should be two lanes each way, excluding on-street parking.
- Noise walls are proposed on the eastern side of Palmer Street, opposite the sites. The visual appearance, and subsequent impact of these noise walls has not been addressed. Natural textures and screen planting is considered essential. Details of these elements are requested.
- Given that the southern end of Bossely Terrace is in private ownership, confirmation is requested that no attempt will be made to close the lane during the construction process or upon completion of the road. The lane is an integral component of the sites current operations and the redevelopment proposals.
- Only the northbound Expressway lanes are to be tolled, not the ramp lanes from William Street. To ensure on-going viability and patronage from the Eastern suburbs community, any suggestion for tolls on the northbound carriageways of the ramp from William Street would be resisted.

1143. CARTWRIGHT Peter

- Will onlt accept a tunnel underground from Link Road to the Cahill Expressway. Consideration has not been given to the increased traffic generated by the Fox Studio, Green Square, The Moore Park Garden Development, and the Meriton/ARI development.
- The above ground sections of the toll road will require public parkland.
- Pedestrian access to Moore Park, the Sydney Football Stadium and the Sydney Cricket Ground will be restricted.
- Noise pollution will increase due to the proposal.
- The proposed above ground sections will increase air pollution to levels in excess of standards.
- The community was not widely consulted.
- The nomination of the prefered motorway builder and the float of ITA means that there was hasty and minimum discussions with local communities regarding an already determined Eastern Distributor. This makes the EIS process a sham.

1144. CARTWRIGHT Lilian

- The tunnel should be extended from Link Road to the Cahill Expressway.
- Concerned that the above sections of the toll road will require the use of public parkland.
- Residents will be severed from Moore Park the Sydney Football Stadium and the Sydney Cricket Ground.
- Proper consideration has not been given to the increased traffic generated by Fox Studios, the Moore Park Gardens Development, and the Meriton/ ACI development
- The RTA did not consult with the community. One hundred homes were door knocked and 90% were not consulted.
- The nomination of the preferred motorway builder and the float of ITA means the RTA's hasty and minimal discussions with local communities regarding an already determined Eastern Distributor makes the EIS process a sham.
- Concerned with the air pollution and noise pollution generated by the increased use of cars.

1145. CARTWRIGHT Matt

- The only solution for the proposal is a tunnel from Kensington to the Cahill Expressway.
- The Eastern Distributor will scar forever the gateway to Australia.

1146. ILLEGIBLE.

Form type L1

1147. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1148. RE David

- The solution to Sydney's long term transport planning problems lie in a mixture of an efficient road and public transport system. The emphasis continues to be placed almost solely upon freeways and road expansion at the expense of a cheap and extensive system of public transport.
- The comparison between European cities which make the best use of their urban environment and the urban disorder that marks Sydney's transport is stark.

- An acceptable solution is to demolish the Cahill Expressway and build a tunnel linking the Harbour Tunnel to Link Road. This tunnel should intersect an east west tunnel under William Street.
- The distributor is no solution to the problem. Like the Harbour Tunnel and the Glebe Island Bridge, it will only move the traffic jam several kilometres further down the road.

1149. BARAKATE J.E.

Form type L1

1150. STAPLETON Chris

- The following nineteen points provides an alternative for the Eastern Distributor. This alternative would mean that a supplementary EIS would not be required except for moving the toll collection plazas south. The total cost of these changes is \$160m to \$200m. Relocation of the toll and the extension of benefits using the toll are \$70m-\$130m. Taking the mid point of \$100m is an acceptable value against the benefits gained. Since the financial benefit of points 1-19 are raised in the south, an alternative may be to defer work to the north, e.g. delay work at the Domain, a saving of possibly \$40m.
- 1. Design the eastern tunnel to allow future connections to a tunnel under William Street and for a tunnel to pass along William Street. This would allow a road to pass between the north and south deck under William Street.
- 2. Relocate the proposed access between William Street and the Eastern Distributor between Bourke Street and Palmer Street south of William Street. Bourke Street and Palmer Street could be reinstated as local streets. State adjoining land can be sold and the profit placed back into the scheme.
- 3. Extend the tunnel south to Todman Avenue, two lanes in each direction. This would reduce traffic in South Dowling Street.
- 4. Limit the number of traffic lanes on the surface of South Dowling Street to two traffic lanes in each direction in peak periods while extending the tunnel. This would increase toll revenue as more drivers will chose the toll road and it would cover additional costs.
- 5. Allow for parking on the western , Surry Hills side of South Dowling Street. This would be convenient for residents, businesses and provides a permanent barrier between the footpath and traffic.
- 6. Allow for natural air circulation for the tunnel south of Fitzroy street through air vents in the central median with generous provision for pedestrians. This would reduce the cost of the extension of the tunnel while meeting design objectives. This would mean there would be no intrusion on Moore Park (7m vent, 1m barriers between slot and fence, 7m carriageway in each direction and 3m parking lane, a total of 26 m)

- 7. Provide mid-block pedestrian crossing signals at intervals not exceeding 400m. This would provide access to the Park and increase safety.
- 8. Limit access to the deck below South Dowling Street. This will reduce visual impact of access ramps and portals and reduce cost.
- 9. Provide an entry to the tunnel for northbound traffic on South Dowling Street between Cleveland Street and Fitzroy Street, adjacent to the Antique Centre. This will allow traffic generated between Link Road and South Dowling Street to enter the tunnel travelling north and thereby avoid local streets.
- 10. Provide an exit tunnel for southbound traffic at the same location. The two portals will be 10m wide and the roadways will intrude into the footpaths of Moore Park Road by 3.0m. This is 4m less than the current proposal.
- 11. Locate an exit and entry portal in Anzac Parade and Moore Park Road. The proposed portal in Drivers Triangle is not suited to this entry to the City and is intrusive to residents. Its removal can be achieved by extending the portals further away from Drivers Triangle to allow an entry portal to fit over the exit. This will reduce traffic at the intersection of Moore Park Road and Anzac Parade thereby allowing for light rail or bus priority through the intersection.
- 12. Consider direct access to Drivers Avenue or a car park serving the Fox Studio and Sporting complex. This requires a exit which would pass under the westbound traffic in Moore Park Road and Drivers Avenue
- 13. Design to allow for electronic toll collection. Toll plazas can be smaller and more streamlined, temporary areas can be allocated to manual toll collection.
- 14. Consider moving the toll collection south. This will reduce the scale of the roadway at the Art Gallery but will increase costs elsewhere. This would allow for connection onto the cross City tunnel without additional toll plazas. Alternative location is a series of toll plazas on the upper deck at Driver' Triangle before the tunnels merge; or catering for all movements or to move the main toll collection further south to a covered plaza between Link Road and Todman Avenue for traffic from Southern Cross Drive. This would require innovative design.
- 15. Extend the tunnel from William Street to north of Kidman Cottages (Priority 1). This re-establishes the social fabric and maintains visual links.
- 16. Extend the tunnel under Sir John Young Crescent without toll plazas. Lowering the road allows for contoured park link between the Art Gallery and the Woolloomooloo Wharf. Tunnel will be required to run parallel due to stormwater channel in Plunkett Street.
- 17. Provide access to and from Palmer Street via onloading and offloading to central lanes of the tunnel, crossing Sir John Young Crescent at traffic signals. The merger of tunnel traffic and the onloading of traffic from Palmer Street would occur well below the current

road level under the Art Gallery Bridge. In the long term Palmer Street traffic would be located underground and this would cater for local traffic and traffic from Cowper Street Wharf. The entry under the Art Gallery link can be treated in a sensitive way and requires an innovative architectural design.

- 18. Provide access to and from the City via the outside lanes which can be removed in the future. Separating the onloading and offloading to different lanes removes all weaving. This provides direct access to Macquarie Street with traffic "appearing" in the Domain about 100m north of the Art Gallery Road bridge.
- 19. Lower the existing roadways across the Domain and cover all through traffic lanes. The only visible traffic would be to and from Macquarie Street. (This can be achieved by temporarily closing the Cahill Expressway, completing two lanes at a time while maintaining traffic to the harbour Tunnel on the remaining four lanes).
- Along South Dowling Street the design reflects the increased role and therefore traffic demand of the orbital road. The creation of four through traffic lanes and four local lanes will sever the Surry Hills community from Moore Park.
- The access portals in Moore Park Road, near houses and Driver Triangle will remove trees and a well defined open space, compared to that in Anzac Parade which is acceptable. Consultation could have been better on this issue with residents.
- There is intrusion into the park of 7m at one location. As there is four, not two vertical barrier walls between houses and the park on the approach to intersections along South Dowling Street this will be intrusive. Traffic noise will be reflected.
- The high demand along the surface of South Dowling Street is unlikely to result in improvement in east west travel which is one of the benefits which the residents of the eastern suburbs expect.
- The proposal in east Sydney, including the elevated road, toll booths and administration building will remove the vista from Haig Park and Hyde Park to Woolloomooloo Bay.
- Sir John Young Crescent is relocated to fit under the toll plaza out of its present grand approach to the Bay. It is one of the grand boulevards of this City and it can not be let to disintegrate as a bus terminal.
- Concerned about impacts on access to Woolloomooloo, the Art Gallery and the Domain. The area can be repaired and become a strong part of the inner city.
- Residents near Palmer Street are faced with difficulty of crossing the road due to the proposal. The proposal will make Palmer Street divisive requiring crossing one roadway at lights, then using a pedestrian bridge climbing over the remaining 8 lanes of road. Cathedral Street used to be the focus of Woolloomooloo, now it will almost be destroyed.

- The current design does not reflect the scale of the Orbital road and destroys the fabric of local communities rather than building on it. Residents have reservations about the amelioration requirements of adverse impacts on their amenity.
- Supports the need for the Distributor to become part of the Sydney Orbital system. The impact of the orbital will have a huge impact on the distribution of long and medium length journeys. These changes have not been reflected in traffic planning and will possibly result in higher demands outside peak periods.
- Sydney orbital road flows (150,000 vpd) should not be tolerated for a new road passing through a community. If the strong connections from the M5 to the Harbour Tunnel are not made then long distance traffic, which has increased compared with earlier plans, will continue to disperse in smaller amounts through metropolitan arterial roads.
- Residents consider that this is not the Eastern Distributor that they thought it would be. It is bigger and not just the link from the north to the airport.
- The design is dominated by the need for toll collection and minimising the cost of the design. The current proposal should not be considered.
- The east-west tunnel (cross city/Market Street tunnel) has not been considered in the planning of the Eastern Distributor. The consortia bidding for the Distributor were advised of the Cross City tunnel and to make allowances to include linking it to William Street. This is not reflected in the current proposal.
- Issues such as ameliorating east west access for local residents, paying for the proposed changes and removing through traffic from Palmer Street can be resolved by taking a wider view of regional issues.
- The current plans for the Cross City Tunnel (RTA/Sydney Council), would mean that the exit from William Street from the Eastern Distributor will only carry some regional traffic to the Cross City tunnel and most traffic would use local streets. The plan would also result in portals in William Street and King Cross tunnel which would not be visually pleasing.
- There should be a future connection of the Cross City Tunnel to the Eastern Distributor via an extension under William Street (cost \$30m) and revenue of \$70m. Then a link between the Kings Cross Tunnel and the Domain under William Street.
- The proposal is for traffic to be accommodated by a turning between William Street and Palmer Street. The value of land in Palmer Street would increase. The removal of traffic from William Street would provide the opportunity to create a boulevard. If the Cross City tunnel is built traffic can move over to the Cross City tunnel and then the Harbour Bridge, which would mean that an additional underground traffic lane would not be required between the link between William Street and the Domain. The third lane under the Domain (in each direction) could be used to access Macquarie Street and close or connect the surface road across the Domain to the Tollway. City traffic would exit into

Macquarie Street near Circular Quay. The cost of the additional proposal is \$215m-\$255m and revenue \$210m-\$230m.

- Contractual details of how further links can be completed needs to be established now, such as a light rail system. Competition should be able to occur.
- Traffic is restricted at Link Road and Crescent Street. This will divert traffic to the remaining east west roads and effectively take away some of the benefits the local residents might obtain from easier east west access.
- Due to the proposal Palmer Street is a "street" carrying 151,000 vehicles. Future flow for the Domain is 182,500vpd. On South Dowling Street the estimated flow is 125,500vpd compared to the current flow of 82,000 vpd. These are high volumes for residential street.
- A framework should be provided to optimise improvements in surrounding streets eg Bourke and Crown Streets. There is concern that local streets will be used to accommodate more traffic, as road space is emptied by motorists using the tunnel. This includes people on local street avoiding paying the toll. Concerned that there will be no funds available to undertake local improvements.
- The EIS should include traffic control measures to limit through traffic in Crown Street, Bourke Street, Liverpool Street and other local streets.
- A budget and source of funding should be established as part of the EIS for Local Area Traffic Management
- LATM proposals should be developed through a community consultation program.
- A scheme to ameliorate the impacts of additional traffic in Moore Park Road and limiting the capacity in the future should be included in the EIS.
- The EIS should include a design for transit lanes to operate in the centre of Oxford Street and Flinders Street, designed to accommodate a future light rail link to the Fox Studios and beyond.
- A design for Taylor Square which takes advantage of traffic reduction and increased priority for public transport should be included in the EIS.
- To meet the objective of building the Distributor by the year 2000 without undertaking another EIS, the tunnel should be extended to the north and south.

1151. VEERMAN Garry, Jan, Leanne and Andre

- Concerned about close proximity of the route to a conservation and heritage area.

- Concerned that the view over Moore Park will be replaced with a view of a 10 lane motorway.
- The 24 hour noise pollution will be nearly double WHO standards which will cause difficult in sleeping.
- Concerned that there is a lack of major pedestrian routes. Access to recreational areas, schools, sporting venues and shops will be limited due to the increase in constant heavy traffic and the motorway will be hazardous for young children and pets.
- Properties along the motorway will suffer a valuation decrease.
- There is a lack of provision for parking in the area. If the motorway goes ahead residents will not be able to park in front of their property on South Dowling Street.
- If the proposal proceeds it will be difficult to make local area trips.
- Request that the toll road be extended as an underground tunnel, providing the community with no loss of valuable parklands and substantially less noise and traffic pollution. The tunnel is an environmentally friendly solution to facilitate through traffic. It will avoid many dangers, hazards, inconveniences and pollution and maintain the aesthetic appeal.

1152. GILDER James

- An alternative to the proposal is: a tunnel from Anzac Parade with a connection at South Dowling Street and then below Surry Hills, Central Railway and Broadway to emerge at Darling Harbour. An entry and exit would be provided at Broadway for a Pitt and George Streets connection and a further connection at the junction of Broadway and Abercrombie Streets for traffic to and from Parramatta Road. A new road would be constructed from the tunnel to rise above Darling Harbour and connect with the existing city road, the proposed new bridge and Sydney Harbour Bridge. A counter-balanced cantilever bridge with 100% reflective surface that reflects the sky and renders the structure almost completely invisible, thus maintaining the integrity of the existing Sydney Harbour Bridge would be built. The bridge would be mounted on the existing pylons and be of light weight reinforced concrete construction. The structure of the bridge would be triangular in section and contain 3 levels of air conditioned retail space, moving footpaths in both directions on both sides and a Monorail that proceeds from the existing Monorail at Darling Harbour, to North Sydney along the western side of the bridge, with stops at various locations, and returns along the eastern side back to Darling Harbour. The incline of the bridge would be 1 in 12 and the internal architecture would be light weight construction stepped up at various intervals providing 3 levels of retail and public space. Roadworks at the top level of the bridge would be mounted on vibration reducing surfaces and would provide for up to 8 lanes of traffic each way plus 2 footpaths and a median strip.

- The benefits of this proposal are extensive and will provide world class facilities combined with magnificent 360 degree views across all of Sydney and surrounding districts.
- The commercial viability of this proposal will generate employment opportunities well into the future and serve as a way of financing the entire project.
- Under this proposal, it will mean that an opportunity exists to demolish the Cahill Expressway at Circular Quay and relocate the existing railway link underground, leaving the section of the roadway that exists through the Domain, to service the City and the Harbour Tunnel only.
- The existing underpass at William Street should be the entrance and exit to the new RTA Tunnel proposal, but the William Street access needs re-thinking. The building at the lower end of Palmer Street, has little or no architectural or historical value and could be demolished to widen the existing road for two way traffic.
- The section of the road that proceeds through the Domain at Woolloomooloo is deep enough in the ground to be able to form a tunnel which could then be grassed over and returned to the public domain. The widening of the roads in this area can only be seen as a disaster. A surface road could be laid between the entry and exit point of the above proposed tunnel, from Anzac Parade to the junction of Moore Park Road and Driver Avenue.
- The combination of the RTA proposal and the above proposal is the way to proceed, even if the new bridge does not eventuate there is no reason why this scheme can not integrate with the existing Harbour Bridge. The environmental impact of this proposal, is both socially and physically less than the other current proposal.
- Anzac Parade would cause traffic chaos during construction and the visible aspects of both entry and exit would be negative.
- Traffic distribution of the existing and proposed RTA Eastern Distributor would be significantly reduced as would all of the other main arteries in and around the city area and North Sydney, leading to a less congested and more even traffic flow throughout the city generally.
- The proposed RTA tunnel in Moore Park Road and Anzac Parade should not proceed, on the basis that Moore Park Road will be socially impacted.

1153. ELLIS Libby

- The Eastern Distributor proposal will attract patronage away from existing public transport. Residents of the eastern suburbs are some of the highest users of public transport in Sydney.
- The Eastern Distributor should not proceed because the decision-making tool (the EIS and social impact assessment) upon which it is based is fundamentally lacking.

- The EIS has been treated as a hurdle to be surmounted in gaining development approval (and a RTA marketing platform), rather than part of an ongoing and integrated environmental and social planning process concerned with transport issues in Sydney.
- The Eastern Distributor should not go ahead because the proposal will generate more traffic on Sydney's roads, leading to significant increases in air pollution, which in turn leads to further social, health and environmental problems.
- Building ventilation shafts is not an adequate response to the increase in air pollution. Vehicle kilometres should be reduced.
- Patronage should not be attracted away from existing public transport and future public transport like the New Southern Railway.
- The RTA and consultants deny the existence and importance of the "induced traffic" phenomenon. Building more roads generates more road journeys.

1154. MATSON Murray

- The EIS is inadequate for the following reasons: the results of the wind tunnel analysis requested by the EPA adjacent to the Eastern Distributor's ventilation outlets are not yet known; the consideration of future fuel supplies is inadequate; and there is an inadequate addressing of the principles of ESD.
- The Environment Protection Authority has asked for a wind tunnel analysis to predict pollution patterns adjacent to the Eastern Distributor's ventilation outlets and these results are not yet known. The EIS is inadequate until this is undertaken.
- The Eastern Distributor will go through old industrial sites and may unearth unmarked, abandoned gas lines. The excavated "cut" may therefore be contaminated. The contaminated cut will be "blended" out with non-contaminated material and land fill with the option of ocean dumping not ruled out. Rejects the ocean disposal option. Excavated material should be recycled where practical and that land fill should be a disposal option of last resort.
- The EIS's consideration of the future of fuel supplies is inadequate. The EIS acknowledges that fuel supplies are "finite" but appears to make little real attempt to offer a prediction as to when and how declining fuel supplies will affect usage of the Distributor and thus its future value to the community.
- The EIS claims (Ch1, p.7) that one overall benefit of the Eastern Distributor will be to increase public transport opportunities, but Fig 5.7c shows that part of the bus roadway running along Anzac Parade will be removed upon completion of the Eastern Distributor, thus blocking the light rail "corridors" running from Taylor Square down to both Randwick Junction and La Perouse.

- Objects to the threat to the continuity of the light rail corridors and calls for the bus roadway to be maintained for public transport.
- The EIS states that the extra capacity provided by the Eastern Distributor will be exhausted by 2011 (Ch10, pp. 10-23)). There is to be little gained by spending \$600 million on providing a facility that will be exhausted in less than 11 years after the 2000 opening date.
- The "Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment of the United Kingdom of Transport (HMSO London, 1994)" raised strong doubts that the building of additional urban motorways is an effective strategy in reducing vehicle congestion.
- The RTA's own 1990 "Road Transport Future Directions" warned that if the RTA's freeway building policy continued for the next 25 years, there would be dramatic increases in traffic congestion and fuel consumption and a decline in air quality.
- The EIS displays a poor addressing of principles of ESD, as shown in the inadequate outline in the Rust PPK paper (Ch1, page 10).

1155. DONOVAN Jim

- Constructing the project will worsen traffic noise as traffic volumes will increase and speeds will also increase. Any saving of noise on local streets nearby will be more than offset by extra travel spread all over Sydney, as the motorway will generate more traffic.
- Working paper 3 mentions that 10% of the value of property taken has been used to represent the costs to people of having to move on the RTA's volition. 10% is much too low for owner-occupied land, 20% would be more reasonable. Raising this allowance would of course increase the establishment costs of the motorway.
- Recent government actions have removed tolls from roads deemed to be in the west of Sydney. Imposing new tolls in the eastern suburbs is undesirable, because it heightens the difference between east and west. This matter should be discussed in the EIS but it is not.
- The project should not proceed until a new EIS is undertaken. This would have the additional benefit of permitting submissions to be prepared in a less hurried fashion than the present deadline of 24 December permits.
- Because the project is not a viable one when the benefit/cost ratio is calculated correctly, the project should not be built. Treasury guidelines preclude the construction of unviable projects like this. Note that significant public funds are involved, from both State and Commonwealth.
- There is no indication of how risks are proposed to be distributed between private and public sectors. This is a vital omission. The M2 and Harbour Tunnel are examples of projects where the government of the time saddled the public of NSW with large possible

liabilities in the event of certain contingencies, such as traffic shortfalls. In the present case, these contingencies are real ones. The EIS should address this point.

- The consortium apparently have a certificate under Division 16L of the Income Tax Assessment Act. This represents a substantial subsidy of the project by the taxpayer. The subsidy should be included in the establishment costs in the EIS.
- Building roads such as the Airport Motorway widens the gap between motorised and non-motorised people. People deprived of mobility ultimately cause huge social problems. This matter should be recognised as a cost of increasing reliance on the private car and taken into account in determining the project.
- The road as proposed in the EIS will cut off easy access from much of Woolloomooloo to the Domain and beyond. It will also cut off much of the western side of South Dowling Street and Southern Cross Drive from the eastern side. This is unacceptable. The same principle applies especially to pedestrian and cycle travel.
- Australians are the world's worst emitters, per head, of gases which accelerate the enhanced greenhouse effect. Building roads such as the Airport Motorway runs contrary to reducing emissions, because they foster long-distance car travel and actually generate vehicle-kilometres travelled. The most easily achieved reduction in emissions would be from the transport sector, especially the private motor car.
- The motorway is likely to see steady growth in freight traffic. PM-10 and benzene, two components of exhaust emissions from heavy vehicles, are recognised as harmful to human health. This has not been modelled in the EIS.
- It is now accepted, except by the RTA, that Australia's domestic crude oil supply has peaked. The recent jump in LPG fuel prices and its effects on the taxi industry show how vulnerable a small part of the transport sector is to loss of cheap fuel.
- No-one can say how much oil prices might rise by the next few years, but it is clear that we should reduce Sydney's dependence on the private motor vehicle. Building road infrastructure around Sydney is a retrograde step.
- Extremely low-powered vehicles are unpleasant to drive for long distances and the need for roads such as the Airport Motorway will disappear when high fuel prices cause motorists to select light vehicles that would not be accepted in 1996 driving conditions.
- According to page 1-10 of WP3, the RTA "seeks to ensure that major road proposals do not infringe any of the principles" of the ESD. This statement is false. Major roads recently promoted by the RTA include the Harbour Tunnel, the M2, M4 amplification, etc, all have worked against intergenerational equity by increasing the extent to which our generation is drawing on energy and other resources which could be reserved for the future. The motorway also works against ESD by encouraging long-distance car travel and hence increasing the number of vehicle-kilometres travelled in Sydney.

- The state has a policy of managing travel demand. Because building roads like the Airport Motorway work against this, the matter of travel demand management (TDM) should be properly dealt with in the EIS. The authors of the EIS do not seem to understand what TDM is, despite the existence of the RTA's "Travel Demand Management Guidelines", Austroads AP117 1995.
- The EIS seems to suggest that TDM refers to a hoped-for decrease in traffic through small streets of Surry Hills when the Airport Motorway opens. That is not what TDM means. TDM means taking firm steps to reduce the number of long trips in a way that reduces the total number of vehicle-kilometres driven.
- The EIS assumes that air traffic will continue to grow at 6% pa. However, a rise in fuel prices and hence airline costs will affect this. The EIS should examine this, especially in view of the decline in domestic oil supplies and the likelihood that the decline (and greenhouse question) will together force significant rises in fuel costs.
- A press release by the then Minister on 13 August stated that the Eastern Distributor project included a widening of General Holmes Drive to eight lanes, south of Foreshore Road, including the runway tunnel. This work is not mentioned in the EIS. Nor does it appear to be in the M5 East EIS. The present project cannot be determined properly until full information on it is compiled and displayed.
- Constructing the project will worsen traffic noise around its full length. This should be allowed for in the calculation of benefit/cost ratio in the EIS.
- There is a State policy in force that encourages public transport use. Airport Motorway and similar roads work against this because they directly compete for some trips but also because they work against having a compact city which is amenable to high public transport usage. Quotes from Prof. Hensher's 1992 paper, "Socially and Environmentally Appropriate Futures for the Motor Car" (p.8 & p.9).
- The project will reduce patronage on the extended Eastern Suburbs railway (Bondi-Kingsford) which has been mooted in the press and for which at least one expression of interest has been received. This should be recognised in the EIS as a cost of the motorway.
- The contract for the New Southern Railway provides for compensation to be paid in the event of competing transport resources being built. The EIS does not examine this matter anywhere. It should examine compensation, estimate a cost for it, and allow for that cost in establishment costs.
- Working paper 3 mentions low bus travel speeds on major bus corridors. The proper treatment of this problem entails giving priority to buses at the expense of cars. The EIS should canvass this technique.
- Building or amplifying roads, especially in metropolitan areas, leads to an increase in traffic. Increasing the capacity of the route from the Harbour Tunnel to South Dowling

Street by putting a tunnel under Taylor Square will generate traffic, just as the opening of the Harbour Tunnel resulted in a noticeable increase in traffic through Darlinghurst.

- It is wrong and perhaps fraudulent to base traffic projections on the now-discredited approach of building an O-D matrix and scaling it up.
- Draws attention to the U.K. SACTRA report and to the acceptance of it by Her Majesty's Government on 19 December 1994. Since then, many major road-building projects in the UK have been dropped. So why is Sydney's motorway-building accelerating?
- The EIS seems to take the view that travel time is worth \$15 per hour and that this is an expense that ought to be minimised by reducing traffic congestion. Traffic congestion has a positive value. Congestion provides the basic force for efficient allocation of scarce transport resources. Without congestion, huge numbers of people would drive to work to arrive at about 8:45am and leave just after 5pm. Providing for such a sharp peak in travel demand would require a huge investment in roads that would lie idle for most of the day. Any attempt to reduce congestion by road building will always be counteracted by a sharpening of the peak, even before new and/or longer trips are generated which absorb the extra capacity.
- The project should not proceed unless and until a new EIS is undertaken which allows for at least some of the points raised in this submission.

1156. HOWARTH Frank (Royal Botanic Gardens Sydney)

- Signage needs to be carefully considered to minimise the impact on the surrounding area.
- A pedestrian survey is required to gauge the use of the area between Art Gallery Road and William Street along the proposed motorway. The Art Gallery Road access is heavily used by pedestrians moving between Woolloomooloo and the City and is already at capacity for carrying pedestrian traffic at peak times, particularly during the middle of the day. Improved bicycle and pedestrian access is essential.
- Pedestrian safety and access along Cowper Wharf Road close to the underpass needs to be addressed. Traffic already moves at high speed through this area and there are poor pedestrian access mechanisms in place. A more suitable graded access up to Art Gallery Road is also required to meet increased pedestrian need, particularly in view of the likely increased residential and tourist users along this route.
- The pedestrian survey should identify current preferred desire lines by pedestrians.
- The proposed pedestrian crossing (identified in Option 2 pre EIS) between Woolloomooloo and the northern end of Sir John Young Crescent needs to be carefully positioned to benefit pedestrians from Woolloomooloo now and in the future. The concept plan does not appear to be sensitive to that need. The bridge should be architecturally designed and sympathetic to the Heritage precinct of the Domain/Woolloomooloo area. If the motorway was lowered several metres, then, the

pedestrian crossing throughout would be at grade, substantially reducing costs, visible impact and improving security. The same principles apply for the proposed Cathedral Street crossing. Pedestrian flows from both directions needs to be supported by adequate signage and associated path networks in response to channelling of pedestrians into this area. In particular the area at the southern end of the Domain and routes around St Mary's Cathedral need to be taken into account.

- Improved lighting is required. Lighting needs to be carefully considered to minimise the impact on the surrounding area.
- Bicycle access needs to be incorporated appropriately and not in conflict with pedestrian paths.
- The area adjacent to the Cahill Expressway is already degraded by vehicle emissions.
- The area adjacent to the Cahill Expressway is already degraded by noise pollution.
- Concerned that the likely increased traffic flows on the Cahill Expressway will increase noise in Phillip Precinct of the Domain and in the southern fringe of the RBG abutting the expressway. Request continuing discussion with the RTA on possible designs for a roofed over area of the expressway in conjunction with widening Art Gallery Road Bridge and additional noise amelioration treatment.
- Noise barriers should be installed along the Cahill Expressway from Macquarie Street to Sir John Young Crescent to address current noise pollution and expected increase in noise as a result of increased traffic, if the option of lowering the road or tunnelling are not pursued.
- Areas of the Domain and Botanic Gardens are unattractive to its users due to traffic noise.
- The RBG is concerned that general noise mitigation measures used on the Eastern Distributor, particularly in the vicinity of the Domain and the Royal Botanic Gardens, are of a high design standard. The RBG would like to be closely involved in the design of noise mitigation measures and plantings associated with them.
- Shares concern with the Art Gallery that the two lane widening of the Cahill Expressway to the north of the Art Gallery will substantially reduce the amenity of the Art Gallery, especially in the area of the Cafe Terrace, and will increase noise, visual intrusion and pollution.
- The RTA is concerned about some uncertainty over traffic flow into and out of Lincoln Crescent in the area of the Finger Wharf Development. On page 7-3 of the EIS it is stated that Lincoln Crescent would be closed where it meets Cowper Wharf Road, yet on all the diagrams and on the artist's perspective on page 7-31, Lincoln Crescent is shown open. It may be worth clarifying what exactly is to happen in this area, as the RBG is proposing to redevelop the Naval Oil Tanks site in Lincoln Crescent.

- The RBG is concerned about the statement relating to Busby Bore on page 9-32 that "potential changes to the water table...may impact on the bore". It is understood that the bore draws its water from the Centennial Park area and therefore it is uncertain what this reference in the EIS means. The RBG is concerned because it is currently involved in a project with Clean Up 2001 covering the possible use of the bore water for the Gardens and Domain and is concerned if the Eastern Distributor impacts on the water flow through the bore from Centennial Park.
- On page 11-15, under the heading of Flora and Fauna, a statement is made relating to the effects of construction on trees "in close proximity to the drip line...". For most trees in shallow soils, and certainly for all figs, the roots extend way beyond the drip line. It is a common fallacy that you can do anything to a tree's root as long as you are outside the drip line. Each tree must be assessed individually.
- The RBG and the Art Gallery are investigating opportunities to establish a sculpture garden adjacent to the Art Gallery to the east and west. The amenity of the sculpture garden would be significantly improved if associated works to the motorway, such as the pedestrian links, fencing and lighting are appropriately addressed.
- Landscaping design and planting should reflect the heritage fabric of the precinct.
- Planting should be large scale, robust, formal design and reinforce the link between the waterfront and Domain.
- Fencing along the motorway should reflect the current style of palisade fencing along the Domain. This style is effective in controlling wayward pedestrians.
- Trees with an historical association such as figs and Araucarias should be considered.
- Concerned about the bisection of land.
- The development of the Distributor must take into account the sensitive, historic precinct and ensure that Woolloomooloo is not isolated from the Domain and the city.
- There is the opportunity to 'reconnect' the Domain with the Botanic Gardens in the area west of Art Gallery Road. The historical Central Avenue lined with trees planted in the 1850's (within the Domain) was the original entrance into the gardens. There is an opportunity to partly restore the lost amenity of this area of the Domain and provide a stronger physical and visual link to the Botanic Gardens.
- Considers the Trust lands have been degraded visually.
- The social values of the local and metropolitan communities must be considered as carefully as the financial cost.
- The RBG's principle concern is to ensure that the area of the Domain and RBG are improved by the construction of the Eastern Distributor rather than being negatively impacted. Option W5 is the best way to do this, the possibility of roofing over the

expressway is the minimum position acceptable. The roofed area would provide green space where only a expressway currently exists. Both the Art Gallery and RBG would benefit.

- The preferred option for the RBG is option W5. Implementation of this option would allow substantial reconnection of the Domain and the RBG, which was lost when the Cahill Expressway was built. The RBG is aware the cost of this option is high, but considers the cost of the severance of the Gardens by the Cahill Expressway is high. The RBG urges the RTA to consider whether additional funds can be found to implement the option.
- The RBG would like to see the whole length of the expressway from Macquarie Street to William Street underground, or at least lowered several metres to reduce visual and noise pollution, which will undoubtedly increase in the next few years. The complete solution may not be economically feasible, there is opportunity to restoring the Domain/Garden links.
- If the cost of W5 is insurmountable, then the RBG's minimum position is to support the proposal to "roofover" the Cahill Expressway to the east of Art Gallery Road Bridge, in conjunction with widening of the bridge to the west by several metres, and noise amelioration treatment where the Domain and the RBG abut the Cahill Expressway to the west of the bridge.
- The widening of Art Gallery Road bridge by at least 40 metres as a covered grass verge over the part of the motorway is considered a valuable and a rare opportunity to enhance the Domain and Art Gallery setting. This would accommodate cyclists and pedestrian needs.
- The option to elevate the motorway more than five metres higher than the current road levels at the intersection of Sir John Young Crescent (which connects to Cowper Wharf Road via an underpass) is unacceptable.
- The option favoured by the RTA is to construct the tollway almost at grade from Art Gallery Road bridge southwards, with a tunnel taking the traffic from Sir John Young Crescent to Cowper Wharf Road. This is an adequate option, though still with an over-emphasis on the road rather than addressing the impact of the surrounding area.
- The preferred option (pre-EIS) is to lower the road from the junction with Sir John Young Crescent through to the tunnel near William Street, into slots several metres lower than the current grade and relocates the toll plaza south away from the Art Gallery and the Domain. The option has a number of positive aspects which it is believed have not been adequately addressed and should be extended to Macquarie Street.
- The administration building with tower should be more sympathetically designed with the tower as low as possible to minimise visual impact.
- Sydney will be the attention of World focus in four years time and much of its reputation as a modern, sophisticated and cultural city will rely on the quality of its urban fabric.

Construction of roadways such as this should not be governed by financial costs alone. The completed motorway will be part of the community for decades to come and the establishment of a tollway is a clear sign that costs will be recouped.

- The current proposed location of the tollbooths have visual and noise impact on both the Art Gallery and the Domain. The location will impact on potential future development opportunities being considered for the oil tank structure located on the RBG land adjacent to Lincoln Crescent.
- The toll plaza booths should be located out of the line of sight from the Art Gallery and the Domain. Preferably further south into Woolloomooloo prior to William Street.
- Thanks the level of consultation with the RTA and consultants (especially David Chesterman)
- There has been limited time to consider in detail the ramification of the proposed Eastern Distributor Tollway. (letter dated before EIS Exhibition)

1157. ANONYMOUS (EasternDistributor Taskforce Meeting)

- The alternative to the proposal is the extension of the underground tunnel. In the north the tunnel portals should be moved from Cathedral and Palmer Street to connect with the Domain Tunnel. In the South the tunnel portals should be moved from Drivers Triangle to Epsom Road.

1158. MACKENZIE Olwyn (KX 2000 Community Consultative Coordination Committee)

- Concerned that there will be no access to the proposed Eastern Distributor from Kings Cross/Darlinghurst area.

1159. DAVIES David

- Requests adoption of the proposal by the Lord Mayor of Sydney City Council to place the Eastern Distributor underground near the Art Gallery and Woolloomooloo.

1160. CORDATO Nick

- Requests adoption of the proposal by the Lord Mayor of Sydney City Council to place the Eastern Distributor underground near the Art Gallery and Woolloomooloo.

1161. McLENNAN J.

- Requests adoption of the proposal by the Lord Mayor of Sydney City Council to place the Eastern Distributor underground near the Art Gallery and Woolloomooloo.

1162. GLOVER P. (Eastern Distributor Community Taskforce)

- Concerned about the impact to quality and the ecosystem of nearby water bodies and water tables.
- Concerned about the ongoing impact to residents on South Dowling Street of an eight lane carriageway less than three metres from residential property with no provision for green space or an environmental barrier on the western side of the route.
- Concerned about the visual impact of the underpass and resulting traffic flows at the corner of South Dowling and Cleveland Streets.
- There is a lack of planning to solve the east-west traffic management problem. The local community faces an increase in population from 77,000 residents to at least 90,000 within the next few years due to the Green Square Urban development. There will also be an increase in traffic due to the Fox Studios and other events held in Moore Park venues.
- Concerned about the lack of major pedestrian routes.
- The requirement that a major alternate non-toll route be provided alongside the proposed motorway (eg Bourke and/or Crown Street) will effectively sever the Surry Hills area with two major north-south road systems.
- Residents are concerned that their access to Moore Park will be impeded.
- Concerned about the potential degradation of quality of life in residents' environment, including the impact of increased noise and air pollution and vibration to communities which already suffer from one of Sydney's worst pollution environments.
- There is a lack of planning to solve traffic to be generated by the tens of thousands anticipated to visit the new Fox Studios each week in addition to the crowds already attending major sporting and cultural events at the Sydney Cricket Ground and the Football Stadium.
- Concerned about the danger of weaving patterns and speed options due to the combination of state road and motorway alongside each other in South Dowling Street, together with numerous residential street openings.
- Concerned about the threat to children living on the route itself as well as on streets serving as alternative bypasses to access the motorway. The average age of residents in the inner city has dropped in recent years.

- Concerned about an increase in potential for hazard risks, due to an increase in heavy vehicle traffic from Port Botany. There is a lack of an alternate route for heavy vehicles away from densely populated residential areas.
- Since the construction of the Eastern Distributor is proposed to be undertaken by way of Build, Own, Operate and Transfer, there is concern that the current proposal has been formulated taking into account the predominantly short-term profit making factors of Airport Motorway. The community requires confirmation that the long term interests of Sydney, beyond Olympics 2000, will be given priority over all other factors.
- Concerned about the lack of sufficient information to allow the community to adequately consider the proposal prior to comment (eg noise, decibel readings, vibration readings, air pollution studies, traffic projections and percentage vehicle type, speed limits, elevations and cross sections, ventilation and exhaust stacks)
- Concerned about the lack of effective community consultation during the EIS process. The community should be given access to data, and funding be provided, in order that independent experts may be engaged to critically examine the proposals, including the EIS and further establish whether the proposals meet the essential criteria.
- The community should be given a further consultation period following the completion of the EIS in order to allow the community to respond again once submissions to the EIS are received and amendments made.
- Concerned about the creation of wind tunnels and the impact of increased ambient noise to streets currently not affected by the traffic.
- Concerned about the impact of constant noise (24 hours/day) to residents along the route. Currently there are rest periods due to traffic light changes.
- Concerned about the lack of residential parking.
- Concerned about the encouragement of increased traffic growth, particularly in Surry Hills and Moore Park.
- Concerned about the capacity of the tunnels to absorb traffic merging from lanes into tunnels (eg two from South Dowling Street, two from Anzac Parade, one from Moore Park)
- The Eastern Distributor and Cahill Expressway should connect underground thereby restoring the Domain and Botanic Gardens to their contiguous state.
- The southern portal of the Eastern Distributor should be extended from Drivers Triangle to Dacey Avenue.
- Concerned about the lack of landscape plans suitable to the heritage architecture of Surry Hills and Moore Park. There is a lack of sufficient green space between the carriageways, particularly South Dowling Street.

- Concerned about the close proximity of the route to a sensitive conservation and heritage area.
- Concerned about the lack of sufficient time for completion of the EIS so that community groups can adequately assess and evaluate complex engineering and technical issues. Since the first EIS was conducted in 1985 there has been a substantial change and increase in traffic volumes and routes leading into the Eastern Distributor, primarily the Sydney Harbour Tunnel.
- Concerned about the impact of the construction phase to traffic, social impact on the community, damage to sensitive property in a conservation and heritage area. An increase in air pollution, noise and soil disposal is of great concern to local residents.
- Concerned about the creation of a second "Cahill Expressway" at the Domain causing this park area and the Art Gallery to be overshadowed by an ugly, elevated motorway. There is now an opportunity of improving the Domain/Botanical Garden by moving the current roadway underground and rejoining the parkland.
- Concerned about the loss of vital parkland, public space and amenity to communities of Surry Hills, and Moore Park (East Redfern). There should be no loss of park land.

1163. FARRINGTON Frank

- Agrees with Sydney City Council's proposal to tunnel the Distributor. It would stop the eyesore of the toll booth and administration buildings and would not destroy the beautiful adjoining buildings.

1164. HYREEK T.

- Concerned about access for the community to recreational areas.
- Concerned about the degradation of the quality of life in the South Dowling Street neighbourhood. There should be no detriment to the community of inner city.
- Concerned about the impact of the construction phase.
- Concerned that there will be a loss of parkland, public space and amenity. There should be no loss of park land.
- Concerned about the increase of potential hazards due to the proposal.
- Concerned about the provision of alternative routes.
- The tunnel should extend from the Sydney Harbour tunnel to the airport expressway at the end of South Dowling Street

- South Dowling Street should become a boulevard.
- Concerned about the lack of community consultation and assessment during the EIS process.
- Concerned about the lack of information pertaining to noise, pollution, vehicular speed and traffic movement.
- The community should be given access to data and funding be provided in order the community engage independent experts to critically examine the proposals and whether the proposal meets the essential criteria.
- The community should be given further consultation after the draft assessment report.
- Concerned that the proposal has been rushed. People have not had time to consider its ramifications.
- The proposal should consider the long term effects not just to the year 2000.
- Concerned about the impact on residential parking.
- Concerned about the ugliness of a motorway so close to historical established residential sites.
- Concerned about the visual impact of the proposal.

1165. SMYTH Richard

- The road north of Todman Avenue should be kept underground due to the unacceptable high noise due to the above ground proposal. As presently proposed it would cost about \$40,000 to insulate each noise affected dwelling in the street blocks along South Dowling Street. There are about 200 dwellings. A cut and cover construction would not cost much more.
- There is an opportunity to place the Eastern Distributor underground where it traverses the Domain. This would remove the scar from the city's parkland and restore the Art Gallery to the setting it warrants.
- One of the main selling points of the Eastern Distributor is that the freeway would take traffic from the local street system and reduce noise. There is nothing in the EIS to show how this result will be guaranteed. The EIS is silent on future traffic arrangements and how the LATM will be implemented.
- The EIS should contain the necessary information for residents to see what was proposed when the project is complete. It should be able to demonstrate the benefits and to decide on whether the project deserves support. At present no one can be reassured because

there is no information about how this critical benefit will be achieved. The EIS attempts to give a “warm fuzzy” feeling that all is well.

- The EIS appears to have been put together with indecent haste to justify the first part of the project to be completed by the year 2000
- Questions whether an independent EIS would support the project if the time was given to properly evaluate and consider the broader policy and financial issues. One of the problems with private sector driven projects is the pressure mounted to start the project. The 14 week time frame allowed for the preparation of the EIS is symptomatic of such pressure and the support for the project is hardly surprising.
- As presently planned the Eastern Distributor will cost the city dearly. There are severe defects in the plans. Opportunities to make significant environmental gains are not presented. Where are the environmental planners?
- The Moore Park sporting venues are in regular use and warrant special connection to the freeway. Examples abound in the USA and Europe where such venues are connected directly to transport systems. The present design will lead to regular and unnecessarily prolonged traffic congestion in this area.
- Too often in the past cost constraints have been used as an excuse to allow poor quality road projects to proceed eg look at the City and the Domain. A slight increase in tolls and a longer pay off period would solve any cost problems with improving the ED
- The toll booths location in William Street off ramps and at the Art Gallery are in the wrong place. They will significantly degrade the environment of the Art Gallery, the Domain and Woolloomooloo. Locating tollbooths at the downhill end of a tunnel would mean that queues would be extended back into a relatively narrow tunnel. Almost everyday motorists experience delays and queues for the Sydney Harbour tunnel and bridge toll booths but this is in the open.
- The tollbooths should be relocated to Zetland, south of Todman Avenue, to Link Road and to the on ramps. One of these ramps is from Cleveland Street and because it is likely to have low volume entry point it could be closed at night.
- The other two entry ramps are at Moore Park Road and Anzac Parade and appear under designed at present. Both ramps serve eastern suburbs traffic and provide access to two of Sydney's major sporting venues. This alone is enough to justify an upgrading of the design for these access points. This will allow a proper separation of conflicting traffic flows but may result in a greater land take from Moore Park. Such a design would significantly benefit residents living near the presently proposed access points.

1166. GIBBONS Kevin (Centennial Park Residents' Association)

- Tunnelling along the length of South Dowling Street is supported

- Objective information was not addressed by the RTA. The Eastern Distributor fails to manage traffic to the Moore Park venues will cause traffic catastrophe. From the data, frequency of use at Moore Park sporting venues and peak traffic periods has increased. The Fox Studios proposal will lead to perpetual traffic in the vicinity of Anzac Parade, Moore Park Road and Lang Road.
- Opposed to the loss of any parkland along South Dowling Street. The alienation of parkland for that purpose is illegal, contrary to the provisions of the Centennial Park Trust Act 1993, as amended and is entirely inappropriate given the social needs of residents in the municipality of South Sydney, Woollahra and Randwick.
- Supports the extension of the Eastern Distributor exit along Anzac Parade to be linked to Driver Avenue under Moore Park at Macarthur Avenue or via Lang and Driver Avenue only.
- The process leading up to the application has failed to promote the sharing of responsibility for environment planning. The process has failed to provide increased opportunity for public involvement and participation in environment planning and assessment.
- Opposed to the creation of circumstances which will impede and interfere with the accomplishment of the LATM for the precinct.
- The EIS fails to satisfy any of the relevant objects in section 5 of the EPA Act.
- The proposal fails to promote and coordinate the orderly and economic use of land.
- The proposal fails to make provision for public purposes.
- The proposal fails to protect the environment.
- Opposes any access to the Moore Park venues including the Show Ground from the Distributor except via Anzac Parade.
- Strongly supports the entry of traffic from the Moore Park venues into the distributor via a tunnel in Anzac Parade in or about Macarthur Avenue either via a tunnel linked to Driver Avenue or by traffic circulating from Driver Avenue, right into Lang Road and right into Anzac Parade.
- Tunnelling under South Dowling Street and entry and exit tunnelling under Anzac Parade will assist in accomplishing the management of east bound traffic along arterial roads.

1167. CAIRNS-TERRY William

- Concerned about the impact of an additional 2 lanes of traffic running down past the end of Thurlow Street increasing noise and pollution.
- Would like to see the section of two story road run up to Crescent street from Darlinghurst, similar to the construction under Darlinghurst as it will reduce noise and pollution. and no parkland will be lost.
- Concerned at the slow erosion of recreational parklands. Only 5 metres will be lost but an extra two lanes of traffic will take its place. Not only will parkland be lost but the quality of the park will be affected by extra pollution and noise.

1168. BOOK E. Enid

- Linking through to the south will bring more traffic into the area.
- The east-west movement is slow, even on ordinary days. What are the plans for the future?
- Regarding to the development of the theme park by the Fox Studios, there are hints about parking. How does this issue link in with the Distributor?
- Public transport is overloaded before it enters Surry Hills due to the increase in housing project south of Cleveland street. The Eastern Distributor will extend the current situation.
- Public transport is overloaded south of Cleveland Street. How will Eastern Distributor affect the future circumstances in Cleveland Street?
- A Social Impact Assessment is necessary to anticipate effects of the Eastern Distributor. Access to the shops, schools, library neighbourhood centers must be considered.
- Walking is one of the major local transportation in this area. Children, aged and parents with babies in strollers will be affected by the poor traffic management.

1169. SCHWARZ Charis and George

- Construction should be restricted to times other than times of 'normal' sleep and weekends. Emergency accommodation and security arrangements should made for vacated homes during construction.
- Tunnel should be extended from the Harbour through to the Sydney Airport with an exit to Fox Studios.
- Socially acceptable pathways should be established to identify thoroughfares.

construction should ensure that groundwater resources in the area are not adversely affected by the development.

- Although the EIS discusses potential impacts on surface water quality in terms of construction and operation phases, it is noted that it only outlines proposed measures for minimising adverse impacts. Details are to be formulated in the plan and design phase.
- No specific measures are outlined with regard to adverse water quality impacts from the operation but are to be detailed in the design phase. It is recommended that some form of detention facility be included to help in containing spills and materials arising from accidents.
- The EIS needs to adequately consider flooding and stormwater management issues. Although the existing stormwater system is inadequate, the EIS does not consider how the construction/operation will impact on flow paths and how the additional runoff will be dealt with.
- There is no mention of works occurring over any drainage lines. This needs to be discussed.
- Drainage and flooding problems will be addressed at the detailed design stage. This needs to be incorporated as a condition of consent and agreement needs to be reached with the relevant local councils.
- Where expected flooding is likely to occur the EIS has recognised that overland flow paths would need to be carefully considered. These will need to be considered for their erodibility and steps taken in the design stage to integrate non-erodible surfaces or minimise erosion potential.
- The EIS has identified the main soil erosion and sedimentation control measures that would need to be implemented before work starts and to be maintained during construction.
- No reference has been made to the possible occurrence of Acid Sulfate Soils (ASS) along the route. Acid Sulfate Soils Risk Maps (CALM 1995) indicate that ASS may exist between Wentworth Avenue and Botany Road, and may occur in the area between Art Gallery Road to Cathedral Street (classified as disturbed). The disturbance of ASS and their non-management can create environmental impacts with low pH (<3.0), soluble iron and aluminium in groundwater, but can also corrode construction materials such as steel and concrete.
- The EMP will need to indicate operations in areas classed as having potential acid sulfate soil. If excavations are to occur in these areas these should be undertaken in accordance with the EPA guidelines - "Assessing and Managing Acid Sulfate Soils", methods should be used to confirm the presence of ASS and to indicate a management plan for any activity likely to disturb ASS.

- The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan should include specific instructions for management of any contaminated soils disturbed by construction activities.
- The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and complementary Erosion and Sedimentation Plan need to be included as a condition of consent. Both plans should be reviewed by the DLWC and emphasis placed on implementation. Consideration should be given to a person nominated to oversee the implementation as a consent condition.
- The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan should fully detail specific measures for treatment of stormwater before disposal including performance objectives. This is essential as all stormwater from the construction site will be ultimately discharged to the stormwater system.
- The draft Sediment and Erosion Control Plan and draft strategy for control of water pollution from the operating motorway should be sent to the DLWC for comment.
- For DLWC to comment on the suitability of the soil erosion and sediment control measures, including dust mitigation, it would need to review the EMP before construction.
- From a land management viewpoint, provided that as indicated on p9-38, a comprehensive Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan is prepared as part of the environmental management plan prior to construction and the plan incorporates all measures mentioned in the EIS and these measures are maintained and/or modified as appropriate and the plan is prepared in consultation with the DLWC, then soil erosion and sediment discharge offsite should be minimised.
- Due to the unsuitability of available data for surface water quality, baseline monitoring will be required before construction to assess potential impacts. This monitoring should start as soon as possible to ensure that pre-impact data is representative of a range of hydrometeorological conditions. Event-based monitoring will be a key element of any baseline monitoring, as during storm events many potential impacts may occur, for which comparable baseline data will be needed.
- Some of the lands to be acquired for the construction of the Distributor may have a depth limitation on the Certificate of Title for these lands. Land below the depth limits on title are considered to be Crown Land. The acquisition of this land should be undertaken in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms) Act.
- The dewatering of the sand aquifer for the excavation of the two southern tunnels is a licensable work under Part V of the Water Act. A licence will be required for each dewatering site before construction. Site specific investigations to assess possible resource and associated environmental impacts, including those to any existing groundwater users nearby, may be required to be undertaken in support of the licence application.
- The conditions of consent should specifically deal with the impact of the proposed development on the Botany Wetland. Relevant measures to protect them from increased

- Concerned about the loss of parkland and wetland.
- Exhaust stacks and the exhaust system should be located away from residential areas.
- There should be constant monitoring of dust/noise spoilage transport routes involving community representation.
- Detours/alternative routes should be made available for non essential through traffic in construction affected zones.
- Construction of the Eastern Distributor will increase traffic disruptions during construction.
- Construction of the Eastern Distributor will generate pollution, consequently having adverse effects on the environment.
- The Eastern Distributor will have adverse effects on the fragile subterranean ecology.
- The Eastern Distributor will have adverse effects on the fragile stability of the built environment.
- Assessment before and after surveys must be undertaken.
- Concerned about the inability to cope with 24 hour/7 day construction vibration.

1170. KIRIMIB M.

Form type L1

1171. NOBLE Marcelle

Form type E

1172. McGLYUN C.L.

Form type L1

1173. KEARNEY Carolyn

- Concerned about ease of pedestrian access from Surry Hills to Moore Park Road and to Moore Park. Access needs to be improved.
- Concerned about ease of access to the east (from Surry Hills), in particular to Moore Park Road. The proposal seems to make vehicle access more difficult.
- Concerned about the site of the exhaust tower in Hutchinson Lane. It will add air pollution into a residential area. The Moore Park site should be chosen as an alternative.

1174. VAN UMMERSEN Link (Kidmans and Environs Group)

- Considers that there is sufficient money to redesign the Eastern Distributor to make it environmentally and socially responsible. The following funds are available for other projects: * \$560m in the NSW Treasury for the M5 East Toll extension. * \$120 m in the private sector to extend the Eastern Suburbs Railway * a CBD light rail loop. Money should not be an issue. Additional work to improve the Eastern Distributor could be funded by a lottery.
- Finds no indication that the Health Department was consulted on air health issues.
- Concerned about the reasoning behind the relocation of the kindergarten, since there is no health figures in the Working Papers.
- Asks if the Eastern Suburbs railway viaduct is adequately designed/secured on bedrock in case of an earthquake in the vicinity of Palmer Street. If the viaduct collapsed it would sever Sydney's orbital network
- The tunnel should be extended from the southern exit of the Harbour Tunnel to Link Road.
- If the orbital extension is the purpose for building the Eastern Distributor, then stage 1 should be confined to meeting that function.
- Would rather have the current 51,000 vehicles passing Palmer Street in peak hour for the next 4 years rather than 157,500 in 2011.
- The EIS does not give enough information to explain how many minutes would be saved by the construction of the Eastern Distributor.

1175. ROSS John.A. (Department of Land & Water Conservation)

- The Botany Sand beds aquifer system is a very important groundwater resource providing useful water supplies for a range of industrial and irrigation uses in the area that extends from Centennial Park to Botany Bay. It is a highly vulnerable groundwater resource because of its very permeable sandy nature and fairly shallow water table conditions. During construction, site management of any potentially toxic substance used or stored along the motorway route, overlying the sand aquifer, should be carefully planned to minimise the risk to aquifer systems. For example spillage of any fuels stored for use by construction vehicles would be of concern.
- The EIS adequately addressed likely groundwater impacts. The construction of the motorway and environmental management measures proposed in the EIS during

runoff, nutrients, contaminants and weeds are related to the Environmental Management Plan for the wetland.

- There has been no mention of the natural soil characteristics across the site, only the geology and hydrogeology.

1176. LANGFORD Stephen

Form type E

1177. FREDA G.A.

- Registers approval that the Eastern Distributor hopefully will not generate considerable volumes of traffic, will not increase traffic on existing regional and local road systems, will not attract patronage away from public transport, particularly the New Southern Railway, will not subject more people to health damaging traffic noise pollution, will not significantly increase air pollution, and will not spoil the amenity of parks and recreational facilities.
- Money should be spent on initiatives such as the new southern railway and light rail, as well as the motorway.

1178. LIANG M.

Form type L1

1179. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M

1180. HARVEY Jim

Form type M

1181. COOTE Martin

Form type M

1182. MONTGOMERY C.

Form type M

1183. MARTINI G.

Form type M

1184. LAWRENCE Robin

Form type M

1185. LAWRENCE Arthur. M.

Form type M

1186. HOWLETT Leonora

Form type M

1187. SARGENT R.E.

Form type M

1188. JONES A.

Form type M

1189. JONES M.

Form type M

1190. SEEGER J.

Form type M

1191. GRATTON-WILSON C.L.

Form type M

1192. JONES Daniella

Form type M

1193. McGIBON A.

Form type M

1194. DANIEL Gay

Form type N

- Noise will be a health hazard due to the proposal.
- Pollution generated will be a health hazard due to the proposal.

- Moore Park will lose 3 acres of vital, scarce parkland.
- Drivers may use Crown Street to avoid paying the toll, as the proposal will see Crown Street become a two way street. This will aggravate the traffic problem.
- A tunnel along South Dowling Street is a necessity.
- The proposal will isolate Surry Hills and Redfern residents from Moore Park.
- Pedestrian safety will be adversely affected due to the proposal

1195. YOUNG Mary

Form type L1

1196. BELL Andrew S.

Form type L2

- There has been a lack of Local Area Traffic Management plans to allow community to assess the effect on local traffic management
- Loss of 3 acres of parkland and open space to accommodate the motorway is unacceptable.
- There will be adverse effects to items of heritage and archaeological significance.
- Carcinogenic benzene concentrations and other pollutants will increase over residential areas.
- The configuration and scale (the visual ugliness of the design) of the motorway/road routes is unacceptable. The road will be up to 10 lanes wide in many sections with differing elevations and cuttings.
- The aesthetics of the motorway will degrade the appearance of the inner city areas, specifically Redfern/Surry Hills and Woolloomooloo as the urban entrance to Sydney.
- Access and use of park land and public space will be impeded in the areas of Surry Hills, Redfern and Woolloomooloo. These area do not have sufficient green space within residential areas.
- The aesthetics of the motorway will degrade the appearance of the inner city areas, specifically Redfern/Surry Hills and Woolloomooloo as the urban entrance to Sydney
- Night time noise levels are already serious problem for residential areas.

- There will be an increase in truck movements from Port Botany and M5 will further affect what is in many cases an already impossible situation.
- The planned increase in population alongside the route will be further impeded by the decrease in air quality.
- East West traffic management generated by Sydney Football Stadium, Sydney Cricket Ground and Fox Studios or the large scale increase in population along the route has not been considered.
- There will be a substantial increase in traffic by up to 250%, within metres of residential housing.
- The communities affected by the proposal have not had sufficient consultation nor access to information during the pre-consultation process.
- Other options have not been presented for community consideration
- Toll avoidance will adversely affect communities alongside the distributor corridor.
- The only alternative to the proposal is to put the Eastern Distributor underground, tunnelling from Cahill Expressway to Kensington
- Noise levels already exceed WHO standards by over 40db

1197. BAIL Joanna

Form type L2

1198. MANN Tracey

Form type E

1199. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1200. STRATFORD J. R. (Sydney Boys High School)

- The construction of bus bays on Anzac Parade should be included in ancillary works These would service the two high schools, the sporting arenas, the film studios and the general public.
- Should there be a crossing over South Dowling Street to replace the present traffic lights the School would make these following two points; i) the School does not draw a large number of students from the Surry Hill/Darlinghurst area. Special school buses are provided to transport school pupils to and from Central. It is preferred for the pupils to

take the bus rather than walk for safety reasons. ii) In respect of the small number of local boys who do walk to school, the School supports the wishes of local residents generally, among whom these boys and their families are numbered, rather than make a school policy issue of it.

- A tunnel under South Dowling Street would be preferable to the current proposal.
- Traffic jams and consequent delays cause a great deal of pollution and congestion with vehicles sitting idle. Anything that eases congestion on Cleveland Street would be of benefit to the School.

1201. SPARKES Ashley

- The RTA should be held accountable for its failure to protect the environmental quality of residential areas where alternative solutions exist.
- Opposed to the location of the exhaust funnel on the corner of Palmer and Stanley Streets. This is a low level chimney stack, with fumes rather than smoke, which threatens the health of all who live in the vicinity.
- The Eastern Distributor represents little in the way of improvement on the intrusive traffic which residents of East Sydney have had since the opening of the Harbour Tunnel. This arises from the intention to place a toll on north bound rather than south bound traffic while providing an off-ramp to William Street so north-bound motorists can avoid paying the toll.

1202. KOCH Maxwell

- The present plans for the Distributor do not address local traffic management. Adequate steps need to be taken to prevent toll avoiders and other through traffic making use of local streets. Streets of concern are Victoria Street, Boundary Street and Glenmore Road and Palmer Street area.
- More of the Distributor should be placed underground to prevent impact on Moore Park and local streets.
- The plan should encourage the use of public transport and not make it easier for using cars. Making the road a tollway where return on investment is top priority, would encourage more car use and less public transport use.

1203. RUNCIE Dr.N and Dr.C.A.

- The excessive traffic on Robertson Road is a danger to school children, horses, and cyclists as well as detracting from the park environment.

- For many years the Centennial Park residents have been promised by the Local Government Plan that traffic in the precinct would be reduced. Virtually the same plan has been approved in 1974 (Action plan 30), 1978 (interdepartmental Committee) and in 1991 (LATM). In order to eliminate much of the through traffic from Robertson, Lang and Cook Roads it has been proposed to dead end Robertson Road (south end) at the busroadway and to divert traffic up Driver Avenue to Moore Park Road (a six to eight lane road that DMR/RTA proposed to widen till just recently). This local plan was flexible enough to cope with the small percentage of time during which Driver Avenue might have to be closed off. This percentage is falling with the imminent departure of the RAS. The LATM and its predecessors have been endorsed by many meetings of local residents established as a garden suburb to flank and enhance Centennial Park. The Council has deferred full implementation until the Eastern Distributor plans and the future of the RAS were settled. Now is the time to honour long term promises.
- It is assumed that the EIS assessment team will critically review the many traffic proposals in the Fox Development Applications currently on display.
- Access to shopping, such as Surry Hills Shopping Centre seems adversely affected by the present proposal.
- During the construction phase it appears to be important that traffic should be encouraged to use Driver Avenue to relieve pressure on the Moore Park Road / Anzac Parade intersection. The temporary use of the busroadway as proposed is ingenious but needs to be supplemented by the Lang Road double turning bay in Anzac Parade, appropriate light control on the busroadway and Driver Avenue rather than from Anzac Parade at Moore Park Road.
- Access to places of work, study and recreation (Sydney University, UTS and CBD) seems to be adversely affected by the present proposals. Will Cleveland Street/South Dowling Street and Moore Park Road/Anzac Parade intersection be no better as suggested in the EIS? Will the route by Driver Avenue/Moore Park Road /Green Road to Oxford Street and the city be cut off as seems to be the position? It is difficult to see too many pluses for the neighbourhood unless Robertson Road is closed as proposed, and efforts are made so that Driver Avenue, which is a wide underutilised road most of the time, becomes more effective. The assessment report should recommend that funds should be allocated and priorities established to ensure that this happens?
- It has been suggested that the Moore Park group wish to eliminate the Moore Park Road exit tunnel. This suggestion is strongly opposed as it appears to put further pressure on Lang Road and will add to travel time of a significant body of Eastern Suburbs residents. This should be avoided. The present volume of traffic in Lang Road, a two lane road is a disaster for what was intended to be one of the finest streets in Sydney.
- A small group of Moore Park Road residents will not meet with the Centennial Park Residents' Association to discuss submissions on the Eastern Distributor plans. Moore Park Road has not carried its fair share of the local and especially through traffic for years. The diversion of traffic into Lang, Cook and Robertson Roads is against the best interests of the survival of this historically preserved precinct and conflict with the RTA principle of

keeping through traffic on main roads; hence the proposed Eastern Distributor completion. The failure to implement a left turn from Moore Park Road and Anzac Parade has been one of a number of factors leading to excessive use of Lang, Cook and Robertson Roads.

- The excessive use of Robertson Road consequently lowers the quality of the adjoining parklands.
- Temporary damage to parklands should be minimised and /or compensated. The RTA should not rely solely on the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust for advice as the Trust has not shown much strength in defending parkland recently. An example will be the busroadway through dedicated parkland, the RAS site that would have been an addition to the Moore Park regional sporting complex.
- Supports improvement to Taylor Square, Eastern Expressway and Flinders Street flows that are promised in the EIS. Concerned that this promised improvement is being done without minimising the environmental impact especially in the vicinity of the Art Gallery/ Domain and again in the Moore Park area and without proper consideration of the east west traffic problem especially in the Moore Park area.
- If the Eastern Distributor goes ahead in one form or another, one of the first tests will be the Olympics Games traffic. How do you think it will cope with Moore Park sports such as soccer? The present EIS must be regarded as a stepping stone only to solving many of the local traffic problem in the Moore Park area.

1204. JAMES Emma

Form type C1

1205. HUTCHINS Jackie

Form type C1

1206. WHITE Ken

Form type C1

1207. HANCOX Bjorn

Form type C1

1208. WICMOT Wayne

Form type C1

1209. KOTARA K.

Form type C1

1210. ADAMOS Calliope

Form type C1

1211. GULLIVER Lara

Form type C1

1212. CEARL Daron

Form type C1

1213. CORMAN Greg

Form type C1

1214. QUARRY Bill

Form type C1

1215. IRVING L.

Form type C1

1216. ARIAS Alex

Form type C1

1217. SMITH Matthew

Form type C1

1218. FORD R.

Form type C1

1219. EASTBURN Wayne

Form type C1

1220. BENEDECT J.

Form type C1

1221. HANNAM Phillip

Form type C1

1222. DOVLAVERAS Peter

Form type C1

1223. DOVLAVERAS Silvana

Form type C1

1224. TAKAMAA Reino

Form type C1

1225. MOORE Karen

Form type C1

1226. BURD S.

Form type C1

1227. GRAY Tracey

Form type C1

1228. CROWE Marianne

Form type C1

1229. TUTTY Joy

Form type C1

1230. STEWART Merrill

Form type C1

1231. BANNISTER MAURA K.

Form type C1

1232. LORDAN Helena

Form type C1

1233. PENNEY C.

Form type C1

1234. MOSS T.E.

Form type C1

1235. COATES Kate

Form type C1

1236. NEVILLE Therese

Form type C1

1237. BERRIMAN Fay

Form type C1

1238. BAYLISS Jacqui

Form type C1

1239. ARENBERG Harry

Form type C1

1240. O'ROURKE Elaine

Form type C1

1241. SMIGIELSKI Silvio

Form type C1

1242. CALDWELL D.W.

Form type C1

1243. CALDWELL Karen

Form type C1

1244. INGELMO Maria j.

Form type C1

1245. McNEILAGE L.

Form type C1

1246. MOONEY James

Form type C1

1247. MOONEY Shirley

Form type C1

1248. CHAMBERS Maggie

Form type C1

1249. COOMBS J.

Form type C1

1250. PEARSON V.

Form type C1

1251. PRITCHARD Margaret

Form type C1

1252. WHITE Moira

Form type C1

1253. HILL Sally

Form type C1

1254. BAINBRIDGE Carmen

Form type C1

1255. CAMERON-STRANJE A.

Form type C1

1256. CONSTANTINE Carolyn

Form type C1

1257. LENDMAN R.G.

Form type C1

1258. BRYDON Stephen

Form type C1

1259. MANZIERE Roff

Form type C1

1260. DOHERTY Edward

Form type C1

1261. DOHERTY Karla

Form type C1

1262. FRIZE Graham

Form type C1

1263. BARTON Annabel

Form type C1

1264. KORAE Laura

Form type C1

1265. LOWICK Adam

Form type C1

1266. CORISH Andrew

Form type C1

1267. KING Leonard

Form type C1

1268. STERRY W.

Form type C1

1269. LEWIS Lesley

Form type C1

1270. ILLEGIBLE

Form type C1

1271. MEARA C.O.

Form type C1

1272. LEWIS Lou

Form type C1

1273. ILLEGIBLE.

Form type L1

1274. FOGART R.A.

Form type L1

1275. PANTOGAN Chris

Form type L1

1276. ILLEGIBLE.

Form type L1

1277. ILLEGIBLE.

Form type L1

1278. GEORGE S.R.

Form type L1

1279. WHITTINGHAM A.

Form type L1

1280. McAREY

Form type L1

1281. DOYON N.

Form type L1

1282. GRITZAU S.

Form type L1

1283. GRITZAU S.

Form type L1

1284. APOSTOLATOS Nick

Form type L1

1285. COOKSEY Sue

Form type L1

1286. PUSSICH T.

Form Type L1

- The tunnel proposed from Dacey Street should at least continue to Link Road intersection in Dowling Street.

1287. ROBERTS Craig

Form type L1

1288. KAISILE D.

Form type L1

1289. FINOS P.

Form type L1

1290. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1291. KATAROS R.

Form type L1

1292. KATSAROS M.

Form type L1

1293. MOLONEY Emily

Form type L1

1294. KILLALEA Chris

Form type L1

1295. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1296. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1297. CROSS W.J.

Form type L1

1298. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1299. O'BOYLE Pat

Form type L1

1300. ALLEN Peter

Form type L1

1301. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1302. SIORIS Dimitrios

Form type L1

1303. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1304. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1305. YARBRENE Gabriele

Form type L1

1306. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1307. FINCH Amanda

Form type L1

1308. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1309. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1310. CRAMFORD P.

Form type L1

1311. FORRISI H.L.

Form type L1

1312. WALKER David

Form type L1

1313. GAMBA Stephen

Form type L1

1314. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1315. CRADOCK D.

Form type L1

1316. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1317. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1318. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1319. OLLO

Form type L1

1320. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1321. MORRISON N.M.

Form type L1

1322. LYONS M. and J.

Form type L1

1323. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1324. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1325. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1326. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1327. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1328. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1329. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1330. PENGUE Carlo

Form type L1

1331. GEORGIAKAKIS N.

Form type L1

1332. HARRIS J. and R.

Form type L1

1333. MICHAEL J.N.

Form type L1

1334. WARDY William

Form type L1

1335. POLLY Mr and Mrs

Form type L1

1336. HAINES Matthew

Form type L1

1337. HELLGOTT Eric

Form type L1

1338. HAYDEN C.

Form type L1

1339. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1340. BRYDEN Anthony

Form type L1

1341. BRYDON P.

Form type L1

1342. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1343. SEBBAGG Miriam

Form type L1

1344. BORCHAN Cathy

Form type L1

1345. SEBBAGG M.

Form type L1

1346. WILLIAMS G.K.

Form type L1

1347. COULTEN J.E.

Form type L1

1348. WILLIAMS Judith

Form type L1

1349. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1350. BOTCHELON J.

Form type L1

1351. STANLEY Mark

Form type L1

1352. KANAHALIOS V.

Form type L1

1353. STANLEY L.R. and A.A.

Form type L1

1354. MICHALOUDIS E.

Form type L1

1355. THOMAS Katherine

Form type L1

1356. KIRIMIS D.

Form type L1

1357. KREINUS D.

Form type L1

1358. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1359. KIRIMIS M.

Form type L1

1360. BEST V.E.

Form type L1

1361. GOWER R.

Form type L1

1362. CLADAKIS W.

Form type L1

1363. CLADAKIS S.

Form type L1

1364. FREEMAN D.and S.

Form type L1

1365. ILLEGIBLE.

Form type L1

1366. COMINO Charles

Form type L1

1367. PHILPS Leonie

Form type L1

1368. SANTOZ V.

Form type L1

1369. KAKOS H.

Form type L1

1370. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1371. FITZGERALD Ross

Form type L1

1372. MURDOCH Duncan

Form type L1

1373. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1374. WILSON Paula

Form type L1

1375. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L1

1376. ZAKAZEWSKI Barbara

Form type L1

1377. ZAKAZEWSKI Greg

Form type L1

1378. ZAKAZEWSKI Conrad

Form type L1

1379. ZAKAZEWSKI Camilla

Form type L1

1380. ROBERT T.

Form type L1

1381. CLADALAIR Irene

Form type L1

1382. THOMSON Rod

Form type C1

1383. BEALLE M.

Form type M1

1384. SONSIE Brian and MUTCH Suzanne

Form type E

1385. CLEARY P.

Form type L1

1386. HALIL Neville

Form type E

1387. ESSON Merran

Form type O

- Credence must be given to environmental and social impact and not just economic gain.
- Considers that the proposal destroys the entrance to Sydney.
- As South Dowling Street has only four crossings, it will prevent access to Moore Park facilities for pedestrians.
- The proposal will sever Woolloomooloo from the Domain and the City.
- Objects to the loss of parkland and open space which should be retained for future generations and not leave the same legacy as the Cahill Expressway.
- The historic and heritage area of the Domain will be scarred by the toll plaza, interchange and viaducts and wide cuttings.
- Concerned about the lack of community consultation and assessment during the EIS process.
- There has not been sufficient access to data during the pre-consultation process.

- There will be increased noise impact on already affected residential areas. Noise levels already exceed WHO standards by over 40dB. The use of double glazing on houses along the route and the use of these houses to buffer residential houses behind is not sufficient. Night time traffic noise is already a problem.
- East-west traffic management generated by Sydney Football Stadium, Sydney Cricket Ground and Fox Studios has not been given consideration.
- The proposal will impede the quality of life for large residential communities.
- The construction timetable for the Distributor must not impede adequate design and planning.
- Objects to the inducement of traffic to the route resulting in an increase of 250% within metres from residential housing areas.
- The EIS does not resolve the significant environmental problems caused by traffic intruding into and passing through residential areas. As the EIS does not address the additional traffic that the proposal will generate it is unacceptable
- East-west traffic management generated by large scale population increase such as Green Square and ACI sites has not been given consideration.
- Does not consider the proposal is an eastern distributor but is a link to the M5 and on to Canberra.
- Carcinogenic benzene concentrations and other pollutants contained in motor vehicle fuel will increase over residential areas. There is no safe limit for carcinogenic benzene. The current policy of urban consolidation along the route will adversely affect the projected 20-30% increase in population within the South Sydney municipality.
- Objects to three years of limited access during construction.
- Objects that peak hour traffic will continue to pass through Surry Hills further increasing air and traffic noise pollution.
- Objects to three years of high level construction noise.
- The Eastern Distributor should be underground, tunnelling from the Domain Tunnel to Link Road.
- The EIS does not justify the need for a motorway which allows an increase in traffic along Southern Cross Drive causing significant impacts on the municipalities of Sydney City, South Sydney, Randwick, Woollahra and Botany.

Form type O

1389. ESSON Michael

Form type O

1390. ESSON Kirsty

Form type O

1391. CADDWALLER Robert

Form type D

1392. ABBEY Michael

Form type D

1393. DAWSON Joe

Form type D

1394. LAUCEEN C.

Form type D

1395. WILSON Robert

Form type D

1396. DAVIS Brian

Form type D

1397. PARSONS N.E.

Form type D

1398. CIVIERO Annamaria

Form type D

1399. LANCE Phil

Form type D

1400. MADDOCKS Lisa L.

Modified form type M1

- Concerned about adverse effects to items of heritage and archaeological significance.
- Noise levels already exceed WHO standards by over 40db.
- Traffic will be induced to the route, resulting in substantial increases of 250% in traffic, within metres of residential housing areas.
- The proposal will create gridlock around Drivers Triangle.
- Toll avoidance will adversely effect urban communities alongside the distributor corridor.
- Should the Eastern Distributor proceed, it must be underground, tunnelling from the Domain Tunnel to Link Rd, Kensington.
- The loss of 3 acres of parkland and public space to accommodate a motorway is unacceptable.
- Access and use of parklands will be impeded in the areas of Surry Hills, Redfern and Woolloomooloo, which do not have adequate green space within the residential areas.
- The large scale configuration and visual ugliness of what is proposed for South Dowling Street is unacceptable, up to 10 lanes wide in many sections with differing elevations and cuttings.
- The poor design will degrade the appearance of the inner city, specifically Surry Hills, Moore Park and Redfern as the entrance to the City of Sydney.
- Elevated roadways will overshadow the Art Gallery, historic Woolloomooloo and eliminate the opportunity of open space within the city confines
- Increase in truck movements from Port Botany and M5 will further affect what is in many cases an already impossible situation.
- Night time traffic noise is already a serious problem.
- Carcinogenic benzene concentrations and other pollutants will increase over residential areas.
- East West traffic management generated by the Sydney Football Stadium, Sydney Cricket Ground and FOX studios, and the large scale increase in population along the route has not been given due consideration.

1401. KINGSMILL Susan

Form type L3

1402. BERNANDI P.

Form type L3

1403. CARRINGTON Kelly

Form type L3

1404. MITTERDONTER Rel

Form type L3

1405. MARTIKUS M.

Form type L3

1406. WONE D.C.

Form type L3

1407. SALVOWSKI D.

Form type L3

1408. SINGH Subhaven Mala

Form type L3

1409. ALLPORT Sean

Form type L3

1410. MULLER Paula

Form type L3

1411. DILLING Annette

Form type L3

1412. THOMPSON David

Form type L3

1413. HISCOF Windsor

Form type L3

1414. ZEKTSER L.

Form type L

1415. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1416. HILDRED John

Form type L

1417. HAYNES Alison

Form type L

1418. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1419. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1420. BRERETON Helen

Form type L

1421. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1422. HASSAN

Form type L

1423. BAKER I.

Form type L

1424. COLES Mark

Form type L

1425. FEILEN Jack

Form type L

1426. CONTI Lia

Form type L

1427. FARCASM J.

Form type L

1428. DROUBI Hassan

Form type L

1429. KHAMISS Alex

Form type L

1430. MEIKLEREID N.

Form type L

1431. SIMS C.

Form type L

1432. CHENG Vanessa

Form type L

1433. PLESEC Darya

Form type L

1434. NICHOLSON B.

Form type L

1435. MURPHY Kristine

Form type L

1436. ZAHRA Irene

Form type L

1437. ROSATHAL J.

Form type L

1438. HAGIENFIELDS Melissa

Form type L

1439. TEST Darren

Form type L

1440. WATT William

Form type L

1441. O'BRIEN M.

Form type W

- There was insufficient community consultation between the RTA and the general community.
- The proposal was determined before the community was allowed to participate in the community consultation process.
- The community in the city centre and east Sydney can not afford the loss of Moore Park lands which will lead to loss of amenity and open space.
- The toll road will produce more pollution and detract people from using public transport, in particular the New Southern Railway.
- The toll road has a limited life with any gains in offset traffic being eliminated by 2011.
- The proposal should include a tunnel option, thus eliminating the need for reclamation of Moore Park land and reducing the noise and amenity loss in the area.

1442. INGLE John

Form type W

1443. PETROVIE V.

Form type W

1444. MARTIN Asa

Form type W

1445. McCARTMY B.

Form type W

1446. SHANAHAN Mary

Form type W

1447. ROME R.

Form type W

1448. JOSEPH Sarah

Form type L

1449. ANDREW David

Form type L

1450. ETTER Angela

Form type L

1451. DOREY Robyn

Form type L

1452. HEMBROW J.

Form type L

1453. TURNELY Glenn P.

Form type L

1454. RUSSELL Harold Patrick

Form type L

1455. KRAMER Marguerite

Form type L

1456. BUCKLEY S.A.

Form type L

1457. SMIVNOW T.

Form type M1

1458. ROSENBERG Louise

Form type M1

1459. ROSENBERG Morris

Form type M1

1460. MAHE Eihel

Form type M1

1461. MAHE J.

Form type M1

1462. ROBINSON Claire

Form type M1

1463. YAP Sheen

Form type M1

1464. KISSANE Fiona

Form type M1

1465. LACKEY David

Form type M1

1466. KEMP Andrew

Form type M1

1467. DAHL Joy

Form type M1

1468. SMITH Malcolm

Form type M1

1469. HAGARTY Scott

Form type M1

1470. TANNO C.

Form type M1

1471. SCRYMGOUR T.

Form type M1

1472. RADFORD Margaret

Form type M1

1473. MAYO N.

Form type M1

1474. UZCATEGVIGAYMONT L.

Form type M1

1475. McDERMOTT Roth

Form type M1

1476. ARNOTT Andrew

Form type M1

1477. FARFAN M.

Form type M1

1478. JOSEPH Ann

Form type M1

1479. ROBINSON Ann

Form type M1

1480. ILLEGIBLE Martine

Form type M1

1481. MASON E.

Form type M1

1482. MASON Carmel

Form type M1

1483. MASON Carmel.

Form type M1

1484. MASON E.

Form type M1

1485. GIULIANO Rita

Form type M1

1486. ROWLES Kay

Form type M1

1487. RIDGEWELL N.

Form type M1

1488. SUMICH R.

Form type M1

1489. ISSAC T.

Form type M1

1490. REEH V.

Form type M1

1491. CLARK Brad

Form type M1

1492. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

1493. FARRIS Peter

Form type M1

1494. ASael E.

Form type M1

1495. CORISH Andrew

Form type M1

1496. ILLEGIBLE Anthony

Form type M1

1497. FRY Joshua

Form type M1

1498. RYOLE Richard

Form type M1

1499. BYRNE Richard

Form type M1

1500. DANN Geoffrey

Form type L

1501. LYNCH R.J.

Form type L

1502. GORDON Robert

Form type L

1503. CARREY Helen

Form type L

1504. McCARTHY Lana

Form type L

1505. ROBINSON Jeffrey H.

Form type L

1506. FROMBERG B.

Form type L

1507. BOYD Michael

Form type L

1508. SALKELD M.

Form type L

1509. PAKULA Henry

Form type L

1510. BEECHEV Nigel

Form type L

1511. HOPKINS T.J.

Form type L

1512. CONOMOS A.

Form type L

1513. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1514. DENTON Leigh

Form type L

1515. RYAN Marion

Form type L

1516. JAMES G.T.

Form type L

1517. WEST Barry

Form type L

1518. HEAD S.

Form type L

1519. BOWEN David

Form type L

1520. WALTON Pippin

Form type L

1521. SMITH Andrew

Form type L

1522. MADYN Gryphon

Form type L

1523. BROOMHAM R.

Form type L

1524. MULLEN Belinda

Form type L

1525. SELWYN Jennifer

Form type L

1526. O'SHEA Ann

Form type L

1527. WALSH Paula

Form type L

1528. COMERFORD Susan

Form type L

1529. HEAD Peter

Form type L

1530. HARRIS Peter

Form type L

1531. CLOUGH Jude

Form type L

1532. SNOW Yvonne

Form type L

1533. ILLEGIBLE Dave

Form type L

1534. BREMMER Aea

Form type L

1535. ATTARO Leonie

Form type L

1536. CADELL M.

Form type L

1537. BEVWIN George

Form type L

1538. DONOZHAE M.O.

Form type L

1539. THOMPSON Paul

Form type L

1540. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1541. HISIP Kathryn

Form type L

1542. WILLIAMS Lana

Form type L

1543. FIMERD Neil

Form type L

1544. WRIGHT Bruce

Form type L

1545. CONOMOS E.

Form type L

1546. VAN HERK Marion

Form type L

1547. HANEL N.

Form type L

1548. TAYLOR Grant w.

Form type L

1549. D'IGNAZIO F.

Form type L

1550. RENNIE M.

Form type L

1551. CONSANDINE C.R.

Form type L

1552. ROSS R.

Form type L

1553. DOOLEY Michelle

Form type L

1554. SHUTE Sharyl

Form type L

1555. TOMAZ Celia

Form type L

1556. PARKINSON Adrienne

Form type L

1557. ALLARDICE JJ.

Form type L

1558. O'NEAL R.J.

Form type L

1559. QUINN S.

Form type L

1560. CARROLL V.J.

Form type L

1561. HALL Margot

Form type L

1562. LYMN Tracy

Form type L

1563. LIERIE L.

Form type L

1564. WEST Dianne

Form type L

1565. LIERIE L.

Form type L

1566. WEST Dianne

Form type L

1567. BUTLER R.A.

Form type L

1568. HUNTER Lois

Form type L

1569. THACKWAY S.

Form type L

1570. LIESTRANGE C.

Form type L

1571. KILPATRICK Ailsa

Form type L

1572. DOBSON Paul

Form type L

1573. MACINTYRE Jennifer

Form type L

1574. MURRAY Caerleon

Form type L

1575. McDONALD K.

Form type L

1576. SHAW Jo

Form type L

1577. HOLLAND Glenys

Form type L

1578. JARRAH Jo

Form type L

1579. DeKANTZOW S.

Form type L

1580. McWILLIAM H.

Form type L

1581. DEMIRGELIS Hercules

Form type L

1582. FIELD Greg

Form type L

1583. DEMIRGELIS Vicky

Form type L

1584. MASTERS Stuart

Form type L

1585. JACKSON Richelle

Form type L

1586. MURRAY Kristen

Form type L

1587. HINES Carol

Form type L

1588. TRIGG Robyn

Form type L

1589. STANTON Karen

Form type L

1590. JAMES Ann-Catherine

Form type L

1591. KEMP

Form type L

1592. BARLOW I.

Form type L

1593. CHESTER Carmel

1618. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1619. HONEIL C.

Form type L

1620. BEHRENS Timothy

Form type L

1621. BEHRENS M.

Form type L

1622. BEHRENS O.

Form type L

1623. BROOKES Christopher

Form type L

1624. CHELLAS Chris

Form type L

1625. CHELLAS Angela

Form type L

1626. WRIGHT M.

Form type L

1627. FEKIJACS Tina

Form type L

1628. CARDINAELS B.

Form type L

1629. BONNER Jane

Form type L

1630. MACFIE R.B.

Form type L

1631. FOFFANI K.

Form type L

1632. MITCHELL Peter

Form type L

1633. NATHAVAS Luke

Form type L

1634. BARTON Justine

Form type L

1635. OCCE Susan

Form type L

1636. SUMMERS S.

Form type L

1637. KNIGHT Gary

Form type L

1638. CAHILL James

Form type L

1639. BLANCHAR S.

Form type L

1640. CRAWFORD K.

Form type L

1641. SZABO J.

Form type L

1642. SZABO Zoltan.

Form type L

1594. CHESTER Ronald

Form type L

1595. SCANDRETT-SMITH Ben

Form type L

1596. BLAKE Charlene

Form type L

1597. WHITAKER R.

Form type L

1598. BEATTY G.

Form type L

1599. JACK Sheena

Form type L

1600. LANE Ron

Form type L

1601. VONES A.

Form type L

1602. BROWN Tania

Form type L

1603. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1604. MURTAGH Christine

Form type L

1605. LIDA S.

Form type L

1606. FISK Reg

Form type L

1607. SAUNDERS Peter

Form type L

1608. EATON R.

Form type L

1609. VAISVILA Olya

Form type L

1610. SAFFIATI Rosa

Form type L

1611. DEMIRGELIS F.

Form type L

1612. DICKERSON A.Y.

Form type L

1613. PHILLIPS Stephanie

Form type L

1614. COLLIN Janet

Form type L

1615. KELLEHER B.

Form type L

1616. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1617. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

Form type L

1643. MURRAY Tasia

Form type L

1644. MURRAY Ian

Form type L

1645. BROWN O.

Form type L

1646. CARMONT David

Form type L

1647. CARMONT Melissa

Form type L

1648. CARMONT Lena

Form type L

1649. CARMONT Debbie

Form type L

1650. CARMONT Dana

Form type L

1651. CARMONT David

Form type L

1652. BEATTIE Yolanda

Form type L

1653. PACEY Kathy

Form type L

1654. WARHAM Ann-Marie

Form type L

1655. CHEY David

Form type L

1656. SPARKS David

Form type L

1657. FRASER Ross

Form type L

1658. BRUNETTA M.

Form type L

1659. ZUPPY Sandra

Form type L

1660. KITCHEN Holly

Form type L

1661. LEE Brenda

Form type L

1662. CORCORAN Austin

Form type L

1663. RYAN Mark and Leslie

Form type L

1664. PEARSON Glenn A

Form type L

1665. GOODEY Michael

Form type L

1666. HALE Shane

Form type L

1667. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1668. JOZSEF N.

Form type L

1669. BOWEN M.

Form type L

1670. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1671. DEMIRGELIS Bill

Form type L

1672. DEMIRGELIS Maria

Form type L

1673. VETZIKIS Steve

Form type L

1674. VETZIKIS Irene

Form type L

1675. TROUGRANK Chrissy

Form type L

1676. ALVAREZ Pamela

Form type L

1677. TSOUGRAINS Paul

Form type L

1678. HARRINGTON S.

Form type L

1679. KYRIACOU Kay

Form type L

1680. EATON Richard

Form type L

1681. MAGRIWIB Edward

Form type L

1682. KNIGHT Richard

Form type L

1683. THOMAS Michael

Form type L

1684. DINIGAN Collette

Form type L

1685. MARION Robert

Form type L

1686. LYNCH B.

Form type L

1687. CRAFT Daniel

Form type L

1688. MURRAY Anna

Form type L

1689. PANOCCIO M.

Form type L

1690. SAMIN M.

Form type L

1691. BOWIE M.N.R

Form type L

1692. MANSON Robyn

Form type L

1693. DUNN J.

Form type L

1694. MANSON J.R.

Form type L

1695. HERRIGAN S.

Form type L

1696. MACDONALD D.

Form type L

1697. KAVANAGH Katy

Form type L

1698. DEAN Sean

Form type L

1699. HODGE A.

Form type L

1700. KING James

Form type L

1701. KING Irene

Form type L

1702. NEEDHAM P.J.

Form type L

1703. CENDA J.

Form type L

1704. KARNAVAS John.

Form type L

1705. PAULL A.

Form type L

1706. COLLINS A.

Form type L

1707. SAUNDERS Christofili

Form type L

1708. RIDDELL H.

Form type L

1709. SKLEPARIS A.

Form type L

1710. SAUNDERS Chris

Form type L

1711. HARTOG Dino

Form type L

1712. DA CRUZ Mario

Form type L

1713. CAMPBELL Bradley

Form type L

1714. CAMPBELL Tanya

Form type L

1715. KARNAVAS Irene

Form type L

1716. REBBECHI Jill

Form type L

1717. BUCKLAND Fiona

Form type L

1718. KARNAVAS Dion

Form type L

1719. KALATZIS Anthony

Form type L

1720. GASGOIGNE Brian

Form type L

1721. FLANNIGAN Warren

Form type L

1722. KARNAVAS Nick

Form type L

1723. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1724. STONE A.

Form type L

1725. KARNAVAS Dikea

Form type L

1726. CUNNINGHAM Saul

Form type L

1727. KNIGHT Howard

Form type L

1728. KNIGHT Nan

Form type L

1729. McBURNIE K.

Form type L

1730. CLASE Peter

Form type L

1731. STACK John

Form type L

1732. WILLIAMS B.M.

Form type L

1733. THOMAS G.

Form type L

1734. IRWIL Rex

Form type L

1735. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1736. LUCCARINI Marina

Form type L

1737. McGLYNN Peter

Form type L

1738. COLLINS Paul

Form type L

1739. FILITONGA Soane

Form type L

1740. MEREDITH L.

Form type L

1741. VASSALLO Glenn

Form type L

1742. MOORE Terry

Form type L

1743. YING Anne

Form type L

1744. YING Colin

Form type L

1745. ADLERSTEIN Von

Form type L

1746. WALNE M.

Form type L

1747. WEIR Belinda

Form type L

1748. BUCHANAN Jodie

Form type L

1749. MATTHEWS Paul

Form type L

1750. STEMERDINK W.

Form type L

1751. CLIBB Antony

Form type L

1752. PAPADOPOULOS Nick

Form type L

1753. TRIPOLONE F.

Form type L

1754. BLUNT M.

Form type L

1755. JONES Anne

Form type L

1756. NOACK Unity

Form type L

1757. ADAMS N.P.

Form type L

1758. ADAMS J.

Form type L

1759. HUBERT Marc

Form type L

1760. SAMM Nicole

Form type L

1761. IVAPEN Jamie

Form type L

1762. STRATT Pip

Form type L

1763. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

1764. De JAINENTIS Susana

Form type M1

1765. DOMASCHENZ Phil (Environment Australia Biodiversity Group)

- From the information provided it is unlikely that the proposal will significantly impact on any species listed under the Endangered Species Protection Act 1992.
- The RTA should directly consult the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Botanic Gardens on environmental issues.
- The preparation of an erosion and sedimentation control plan to mitigate water quality impacts on the Botany Wetlands during construction and operation of the Distributor is supported.
- Supports the commitment in the EIS to consider the water quality mitigation measures identified in the Botany Wetlands Environmental Management Plan and suggests that these measures should be adopted in the planning stage.
- Drainage along Southern Cross Drive discharges directly into Mill Pond which is part of the Botany Wetlands. The EIS states that the impact will be minimal. Recommends that base line water quality monitoring of the Botany Wetlands should be undertaken prior to, during and following the construction period and the appropriate control measures implemented. The effectiveness of these measures should be monitored.

1766. YATES P.B. (Environment Protection Authority)

- The economic assessment of alternative options to achieve transport improvements appears to be inadequate and the quantitative assessment of costs and benefits is limited to the Eastern Distributor alone.
- The economic analysis should demonstrate that the Eastern Distributor is the best option among the other available transport improvement options or combination of options.
- The presentation of the travel time savings material is confusing, as it appears that the time-saving benefits are being estimated for the year 1996 to 2000, when the Eastern Distributor will be in the construction phase. However, the spreadsheets do show that the benefits are in fact estimated from the year 2000.
- The basis for assuming that travel time savings would remain constant at \$108 million after 2011 (after the road is at capacity) is not clear.
- The economic analysis of time savings does not appear to be robust. Considering the importance of this figure to the overall analysis, better justification for the assumptions need to be provided.
- The 1985 EIS estimated the "direct residential benefit" of the Eastern Distributor. This estimate is updated in the 1996 EIS, using the change in property prices since 1984. It is

not clear from the analysis how the benefit was calculated. The methodology used was the property value approach and the assumed relationship between property value and traffic level was 16% (a figure not substantiated).

- It is not clear whether negative impacts (e.g. increase in the concentration of air pollutants) have been deducted to arrive at net values for amenity improvements, or whether they have been ignored in the analysis.
- It is important that the external costs of air pollution from private motor vehicles be identified. EPA's conservative estimates in 1995 relating to the external costs of air pollution from private vehicles in Sydney were around \$393 million per annum and other externalities from private vehicles in Sydney were around \$213 million per annum (noise, water pollution and waste). Given the magnitude of these external costs, it is critical that they be incorporated into the assessment of transport improvement options.
- A potentially important cost item which is not included in the analysis is the increase in travel time as a result of the 3-year construction period. Significant delays to traffic during construction do not appear to have been valued, yet on the benefits side of the equation the travel time savings of the proposal have been valued.
- There does not appear to have been any assessment of the costs of the Eastern Distributor construction on public transport activities. For example, during the construction period of a part of the tunnel it is proposed that the bus roadway parallel to Anzac Parade be used for southbound traffic for up to six months. This could result in delays to bus services and may discourage the use of bus travel.
- If a quantitative assessment of alternative transport improvement options were undertaken, including an assessment of air quality and other environmental impacts, then the Benefit-Cost Ratio for the Eastern Distributor may not compare favourably with other transport options.
- The EPA suggests that a full economic analysis of the proposed Eastern Distributor should include: (a) a quantitative assessment of alternative options to the proposed Eastern Distributor (including environmental impacts); (b) a clear demonstration that the Eastern Distributor is the best option among the other transport improvement options and combination of options available; (c) a clear explanation of how travel patterns will change as a result of the Eastern Distributor; (d) identification and valuation (where possible) of all environmental impacts, (noise and air emissions) on the change in travel patterns; (e) a clear explanation and justification for the assumptions used to estimate time-saving benefits; and (f) an explicit assessment of the impact of construction activity (over 3 years) on travel time.
- It appears that there is a potential for adverse impacts on the habitat of the Green and Golden Bell frog in the Botany Wetlands. Specific measures to lessen or at least not increase the current impacts should be considered. The text of the EIS (s9.7.5) has a conflicting statement to WP7, where the Botany Wetland is referred to as "... still an important habitat area for the species."

- There is potential for a significant impact by the proposed development on the remnant ecosystems of the Botany Wetlands, including surrounding open space and golf courses. The EPA questions statements in WP7 and in the EIS regarding impact on natural habitats and vegetation communities, since it seems that the proposal may have adverse impacts on both wetland ecosystems and remnant vegetation.
- The potential for use of native vegetation on road verges along the proposed corridor, to complement the existing remnant or planted vegetation communities, does not appear to have been fully addressed. Such works have only been referred to in generic terms.
- The removal of trees along the route needs to be addressed. Where mature trees are being removed, loss of habitat could be an issue.
- No mention is made in the EIS of possible impacts on sewer lines from settlement of up to 10mm.
- The decision to design for a 100-year rainfall at the tunnel portal areas seems questionable (s10.6.3). Where there could presumably be significant threats to life if large volumes of water entered the tunnel, a higher design standard (the maximum probable storm) might be more appropriate.
- The EIS and project plans appear to conflict with some of the stated objectives on traffic demand management in the State Road Network Strategy.
- The EIS does not adequately consider the Eastern Distributor proposal in terms of the Government's broad traffic and transport policies.
- There should be a more detailed consideration of the options for alternative transport modes. Improvements to rail and bus systems appear to be covered in five paragraphs, with broad, unsubstantiated generalisations.
- What would be the effect of improving rail and bus services?
- Demand management on the road network is poorly addressed in the EIS (11/2 pages) with little material of substance. The way demand management is to be addressed as part of this proposal needs to be fully investigated.
- The regional impact (over the Sydney road network) and the potential for induced traffic growth do not appear to have been adequately covered. In short, no substantial analysis of regional traffic impact appears to have been undertaken.
- The concept of an "orbital" road network for Sydney is used in the EIS to justify the proposal. To date, inter-agency discussions involving the EPA have been oriented to concentrate such a route on freight movement, with limited access and egress for other vehicles. This approach is not reflected in the Eastern Distributor justification, where the Eastern Distributor is placed in the context of the "emerging Sydney Orbital Road network".

- References in the EIS to induced traffic growth appear superficial, despite the fact that research has shown new roads have a significant effect on induced traffic growth. It is critical that traffic growth associated with new roads be constrained in order to contain environmental impacts, and, in particular, support the achievements of air quality goals. Inadequate consideration of the issue of induced traffic growth calls into question the claims in the EIS of increased capacity for other modes in some street, reduced noise impacts, improved travel times, reduced congestion and reduced impacts on air quality.
- The economic justification of the proposal will be affected by assumptions made about induced traffic and single car commuting. In order to undertake a credible environmental impact assessment, the induced traffic growth effect needs to be examined fully, claims adjusted in light of it, and robust measures proposed to counter it.
- In the interests of integrating transport planning, and in order to protect and enhance Sydney's air quality, it is imperative that improved opportunities for public transport, cycling and walking, be considered. In conjunction with the planning, design, construction and use of the Eastern Distributor.
- Requirements for these alternative modes of transport need to be considered comprehensively across the Eastern Distributor catchment and demand studies and management plans prepared for them as is currently being undertaken for public transport on the M2 Motorway.
- Specific funding commitments to implement the plans need to be identified.
- This planning should occur ideally prior to, or at least simultaneously with, the planning and construction of the Eastern Distributor, so that measures necessary to support public transport, cycling and walking can be integrated into its design, and high quality facilities and services can form part of the framework for new travel patterns once the Eastern Distributor opens. It would be more difficult to provide for these other transport modes after the Eastern Distributor is operating and travel patterns are already established.
- When calculating the environmental impact of the Eastern Distributor the environmental effects on the road system should be addressed. For example, if the Eastern Distributor induces extra traffic, then the noise implications of this on other sections of the road network should be evaluated.
- The EIS claims to be based on ESD, but does not appear to consider the question of what to do when the new road is as full as the present roads.
- The EIS includes only a relatively minor treatment of demand management and it is not clear how these strategies are being implemented in relation to the Eastern Distributor.
- "The EPA is satisfied that on balance, provided it received the required additional information, it will be able to determine applications and, subject to conditions, grant the necessary Pollution Control Approval and any Pollution Control Licences needed for the project to proceed in compliance with the State's environment protection legislation." The

EPA provided advice regarding Pollution Control Approvals and Licences that would be required. These concerned air, noise and water pollution.

- Documented and implemented inspection and maintenance procedures for pollution control equipment should be in place for all aspects of the project.
- Although the necessary works would need to be economically justified, some of the adverse environmental impacts (of the proposal) could be mitigated by additional tunnelling of the roadway, especially in the Woolloomooloo area and at the northern end of South Dowling Street.
- The EIS needs to demonstrate that the traffic modelling incorporates the fact that reduced travel time will encourage greater vehicle use as well as encouraging people to switch from public transport to the car.
- With a reduction in private motor vehicle use and an increase in public transport use, a stated Government policy, an EIS for a major road should carefully analyse public transport options. If the road is still justified, an EIS should show how offset gains can be made elsewhere. The Eastern Distributor EIS does not appear to make any such assessment.
- As the proposal stands, there are several aspects that seem likely to impact on the operation of public transport in the area: (a) the loss of part of the Anzac Parade bus lane between Moore Park Road and Gregory Avenue; (b) the operation of a number of intersections such as the Moore Park/Anzac Parade intersection that should be treated so as to favour buses. From discussions with Rust PPK, there are several options for intersections such as these, though they have not been assessed as part of the EIS; (c) the extent to which this project may compete with the New Southern Railway has not been assessed; (d) the proposal to disrupt public transport during construction by taking over the busway at Moore Park for general traffic use seems undesirable. It is critical to continue to accord priority to public transport. In general, it appears that the impacts on public transport, cycling and walking during construction need to be more fully considered and measures identified to minimise these impacts.
- The measures forming part of the proposal outlined in the EIS appear to represent a minimalist approach to providing for public transport, cycling and walking, rather than addressing the need to facilitate and encourage each of these modes.
- The proposal needs to address more positively bus access and priority, especially at intersections, and direct and convenient access for cyclists and pedestrians.
- The extent to which this project may compete with the New Southern Railway has not been assessed.
- Matters not adequately addressed in WP4 in relation to noise mitigation, and that would need to be addressed prior to approval being given by the EPA, include: (a) identifying specific receivers or receiver groups that are adversely impacted; (b) specific detail of the mitigation measures to be employed and their effectiveness in reducing noise levels; and

(c) an indication of the overall noise control philosophy, that is, particular noise level to be achieved by noise control measures.

- Noise issues warrant more rigorous consideration than given in the EIS.
- The EPA suggests that the proponent needs to assess the noise impacts against the emerging new noise criteria (includes Leq noise criteria day and night and maximum noise levels to enable comparison of route options).
- If mitigation measures are required, then these measures should be planned to meet traffic noise criteria for Leq55 day and Leq50 night.
- The EPA accepts that the EIS rejects the adoption of TNL55 noise criteria.
- Rejection of TNL55 as the performance benchmark does not mean that the rigours of noise assessment and planning should not be applied and in this regard further work is warranted. Specifically: (a) WP4 fails to address peak noise levels from traffic and the document dismisses any attempt to address sleep disturbance through assessing peak noise levels by concluding that "other more general noise descriptors are used to indirectly assess night-time noise impacts . . ."; (b) The EIS makes no mention of peak noise levels or sleep disturbance. This is a major omission as community response to recent road developments has raised both issues as issues of concern. Sleep disturbance was addressed in the EIS for construction noise; (c) The EIS relies on the RTA's interim noise objectives of existing (ambient) noise level plus 3 dB(A) (or ambient plus 12 dB (A). This approach essentially means that the existing noise level is taken as being acceptable. There is no upper noise limit. As a result the noise objectives applied in the EIS far exceed the (emerging)day/night noise level criteria of 55/60 dB(A); and (d) The measured ambient noise level for sites monitored along the development corridor has not been determined correctly, resulting in a lack of certainty in the ambient noise levels which are quoted in the EIS. Key problems are: Insufficient period of measurement to determine a representative acoustic environment for all potentially affected residential sites; No indication of the validity of the data when taking into account adverse weather conditions; -No proper differentiation between day and night periods used in normal practice; and No advice as to the effect on the L90 (the level of noise that is exceeded for 90% of the measurement time. This means that there is insufficient certainty about the assessment of the level of impact.
- These shortcomings essentially mean that mitigation measures (which are based on the assumption that it is appropriate to set noise levels at the existing level plus 3dB(A) [or plus 12 dB(A)] have not been properly assessed.
- The EIS does not define what noise level has been applied for any given area of noise impact in the form of a number. It relies on applying a criteria of ambient plus 3 dB(A) [or plus 12 dB(A)].
- There is no assessment of the impact of night-time construction noise on sleep disturbance or, apart from some initial indications, an analysis of impact against sleep disturbance criteria.

- The question of continued dependence on fossil fuels, and the likely consequences of limitations in supply is briefly analysed and appears to be flawed. The Hensher article predates the Petroconsultants yet it is claimed that Hensher's article opposes the Petroconsultant's article.
- The determination of any major new road proposal, such as the Eastern Distributor, should include an assessment of the impacts of fossil fuel dependence on the proposed development.
- There will be numerous noise exceedances relative to the EPA's Environmental Noise Control Manual. Such exceedances will only be permitted where there is sufficient justification and all reasonable mitigation measure have been undertaken. Any such predicted noise exceedence from a given work area or stage of the project will require the EPA's written approval where the noise levels will exceed the levels or times specified in the Pollution Control Approval.
- Out-of-hours construction will require the specific approval of the EPA and the proponent will need to justify each request for out-of-hours works.
- All of the construction noise objectives require a re-assessment due to the currently assessed level of background noise being uncertain.
- There are inconsistencies between the construction noise level objectives presented in Table 2 of the Wilkinson Murray (WM) Construction Noise Assessment report and Table 7.1 of WP4.
- There is no detailed analysis of the duration of construction noise that receivers are likely to be exposed to along the route and therefore the correct construction noise criteria cannot be properly determined (in some cases a 4-week period is given which allows the least stringent noise criteria without detailed justification for this assessment).
- There is no identification of the extent of the impact of night-time construction noise on the community and no proper analysis of the benefits of the mitigation measures or what specific mitigation measures are to be applied for each specific situation.
- There is no discussion of worst case scenarios with regards to construction noise. The EPA will require a clearer picture on worst case scenarios, areas of high exposure, best management practices and alternatives to the construction modes described.
- There is no assessment of increased traffic noise during construction, either for construction vehicles or for re-routed traffic along associated road networks.
- There is no indication of the likelihood of the frequency at which emergency generator noise is likely to occur.
- A noise impact assessment on the anticipated noise and vibration levels is required before a Pollution Control Licence can be issued for the operation of plant and equipment.

- The EIS does not address in any detail the effects of the proposal on the loss of amenity on neighbouring parkland. It appears that areas of the Domain, the Botanic Gardens and Moore Park are likely to be affected, particularly from air and noise impacts when the Distributor is operating.
- The loss of amenity to local residents may make this high population density area of the inner city a less attractive location. The views of the Botanic Gardens Trust and the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust will be a relevant consideration of this issue.
- There is no prediction of the level of vibration in residences. Where vibration levels are excessive in residential dwellings during the night-time period, the EPA may limit the vibration via the Pollution Control Approval (PCA) process.
- Detailed discussion with the proponent would be necessary regarding details of any blasting activities and EPA licensing would be required before this activity can take place.
- Awareness of the waste hierarchy of avoidance, minimisation, reuse, recycling and disposal, and incorporation of these principles in all aspects of project planning is required.
- The information on waste management in the EIS is generally satisfactory.
- The EIS leaves open the option of ocean disposal of spoil. This is not a method of disposal favoured by the EPA. The EPA would prefer that the Airport Motorway consider the spoil as a valuable resource for which a market needs to be found.
- Should ocean outfall be pursued, Commonwealth environmental approvals would be required. The proponent would most likely also need to seek an EPA approval or licence for any transfer facility. Such a facility may also require a separate environmental impact assessment and approval process before any material could be disposed of to the ocean.
- The EPA has serious doubts that the tunnel air quality requirements can be met without fresh air being injected somewhere along the 1.5 kilometre length. Air at the tunnel portals cannot be considered "fresh" as it includes emissions from three lanes of traffic.
- Three exhaust vents, one close to each portal and a third near the middle of the tunnel with at least one fresh air inlet for each carriageway, would be preferable.
- Air quality must be monitored on a 24-hour basis, with emergency measures similar to those currently in place in the Sydney Harbour Tunnel.
- Given the complex network of buildings in the area, wind tunnel testing will be necessary for both the Northern and Southern portals, although WP5 only specifically recommends wind tunnel testing for the Northern portal.
- Three exhaust vents, one close to each portal and a third near the middle of the tunnel with at least one fresh air inlet for each carriageway, would be preferable.

- It should be clarified whether the air quality modelling has included a range of vehicle types, not merely petrol-engine vehicles. For example, liquefied petroleum gas vehicles such as taxis (which are higher emitters of oxides of nitrogen) will use the route substantially. If this effect has not been considered, this may influence the accuracy of the modelling.
- Specific enhancements for alternative transport (cycling, walking, public transport) must be provided. The premise that lowering congestion will increase the availability and speed of buses is not an adequate proposal.
- The EIS's details on regional air quality are not adequate. The lack of regional traffic modelling and failure to recognise induced traffic effects leaves this matter unresolved.
- Regarding climatic and greenhouse impacts, there is little material in the EIS that refers to how the impacts of the Eastern Distributor proposal are to be assessed.
- There is no assessment as to whether RTA and whole-of-government strategies to address the issue are expected to substantively address greenhouse emissions. The impact of the Eastern Distributor proposal on greenhouse emissions is limited to a single unsubstantiated figure, stated as an 0.01% increase in the "build" case. Due to the overall superficial treatment of the issue, this section cannot be adequately assessed.
- The impact of the Eastern Distributor on air quality should be examined by considering how travel patterns change and the implications for air emissions by transport mode. As the use of motor vehicles is one of the major causes of air pollution in Sydney, it is important that this aspect be examined in detail.
- There is no reference in the EIS to any attempt to quantify the mass or concentration of pollutants likely to wash off the constructed Distributor. The estimation would allow the assessment of a desirable level of remediation works to minimise water pollution impacts. The EPA recommends there be such an assessment for the Distributor.
- The EPA has concerns in relation to the traffic noise predictions. Issues requiring further work by the RTA are: (a) the prediction model used has not been calibrated or verified within the working papers or references; and (b) there is insufficient information presented to allow the EIS prediction to be validated with any degree of certainty.
- Based on calculations performed at five reference points, differences of +2 dB(A) to +6dB (A) exist between the predicted noise levels and the levels presented to the EIS. These differences may be attributed to the following factors: (a) the noise contours presented (Figures 3a-3e, WP4) do not clearly identify the predicted noise levels or areas of impact; and (b) insufficient information regarding the modelling assumptions is presented in WP4.
- It is recommended that further investigation be carried out to verify the predicted noise levels presented in the EIS. In order to aid this, it is recommended that more information be provided to allow the calculation procedures to be properly assessed.

- WP4 does not appear to discuss predictive error. Various research and other EIS documents suggest errors in the order of $-+1.5$ dB(A) to $-+4$ dB(A) using CORTN and Soundplan. This should have been identified and quantified with the EIS document.
- The suggested method of mixing contaminated spoil with non-contaminated spoil is not favoured by the EPA and the EPA would not consent to such an approach.
- The EPA could provide advice to the RTA in setting criteria for various disposal options for low level contaminated soil.
- The EPA has concluded that the EIS has fundamental shortcomings in relation to noise.
- The EPA will require further information before it can process the application required for Pollution Control approval and any necessary Pollution Control Licences under the provisions of the State's environment protection legislation.
- The EPA is concerned with the EIS's assessment of alternative options, and with the EIS's economic analysis of the proposal. These shortcomings make a complete assessment of the proposal difficult.
- EPA encourages the proponent to adopt an Environmental Management System (EMS) and to develop and implement Environmental Management Plans (EMPs). Contrary to the statement in the EIS, the EPA does not require the proponent to develop, nor does the EPA approve, such Plans.
- Background noise has not been determined correctly in WP4. The key problems are: (a) insufficient period of measurement to determine a representative acoustic environment for all potentially affected residential sites; (b) no indication of the validity of the data when taking into account adverse weather conditions; (c) no proper differentiation between day and night periods used in normal practice; and (d) no advice as to the effect on the L90 of traffic noise.
- The uncertainty about the true level of the background noise means that there is a corresponding uncertainty about assessment criteria used for fixed plant noise and construction noise, since these criteria are based on an emergence above the background.
- These particular assessment criteria relate to the assessment of ventilation plant noise and construction noise. This uncertainty means that neither of these assessments has determined the true impact for these sources. Considering the very significant noise levels indicated in WP4, it is important that the true impacts be determined.
- Table 9.6 of WP4 presents a single set of background noise measurements for use in the assessment of the EIS. This table will not assist with night-time noise controls. If night work is proposed in residential areas, then monitoring similar to Table 9.5 will be required prior to the EPA assessing and possibly authorising the night-time construction work.

1767. MORGAN Geoff (NSW Health Department)

- The contribution of the Eastern Distributor to the cumulative impacts of all the proposed road developments should be assessed in the EIS to determine if these cumulative impacts are compatible with the objectives of Ecologically Sustainable Development and, in particular, traffic demand management.
- The exclusion of a range of health and environmental impacts and externalities provides a distorted picture of the perceived benefits of this proposal.
- At the very least the EIS should assess the costs of air pollution, social amenity and community fitness, and noise.
- Pedestrian access to Moore Park and other recreational facilities should be a priority.
- Pre and post hoc assessment of impacts of new developments on traffic and amenity should be implemented.
- The Eastern Distributor does not align with one of the main objectives of the Road Network Strategy, to moderate traffic growth. It is likely that the additional traffic inevitably generated by the Eastern Distributor will substantially reduce or eliminate the initial benefits in travel time and road safety. Due to the anticipated long term increase in vehicle emissions associated with increased vehicle kilometres travelled on the Eastern Distributor, and anticipated reductions in some air quality goals by the time the Eastern Distributor comes into service, the following goals are recommended for particulate and nitrogen dioxide in the assessment of air quality impacts: PM10 50ug/m3 24 hour average (current UK goal) NO₂ 210 ug/m3 1 hour average (current WHO goal)
- If these goals are applied, the current levels exceed these newer goals.
- The current goal for CO is exceeded in site 2 and 3.
- Modelling of current and future concentration levels of vehicle emissions (Tables 10.9 & 10.10) indicate that emissions from the Eastern Distributor would exceed the more stringent goals for PM10 and NO₂.
- The Eastern Distributor will not lead to a reduction in urban air pollution, and the possible benefits of reduced travel time and road safety will be marginal and short lived.
- The EIS economic analysis uses "only direct quantifiable costs and benefits".
- Many public health impacts and externalities have not been included and this has led to a significant underestimation of the costs of the Eastern Distributor. Health effects of air pollution, noise congestion and fragmented neighbourhoods are not quantified.
- There is little discussion on how the proposed cycle network will be achieved and what sort of facilities will be put in place to encourage more cycling.

1768. WRIGHT Peter

Form type M1

1769. RODMAN David

Form type M1

1770. D'ARCY S.

Form type M1

1771. PEDRYKOWSKI M.

Form type M1

1772. VOLSKA Anna

Form type M1

1773. GRUBMUELK Kristen

Form type M1

1774. ELKINS Joyce

Form type M1

1775. MIRZA Roslyn

Form type M1

1776. LUCAS K.R.

Form type M1

1777. GOYHAM Alex

Form type M1

1778. SANTIAGO Dalva

Form type M1

1779. HALL Peter

Form type M1

1780. THOMAS Jeanne Marie

Form type M1

1781. HALL Phoebe

Form type M1

1782. LOPES T.

Form type M1

1783. ALLNUT Denny

Form type M1

1784. MAGUIRE Leila

Form type M1

1785. NAYLOR Kylie

Form type M1

1786. HALL Virginia

Form type M1

1787. TATLISES Sellatin

Form type M1

1788. PAWAYI A.

Form type M1

1789. O'HALLDRAW R.

Form type M1

1790. BAILEY Linda

Form type M1

1791. CARTER Suzie

Form type M1

1792. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

1793. PARSHOTAM N.

Form type M1

1794. BRAITHWAIR Mr.

Form type M1

1795. ROBERTSON R.

Form type M1

1796. BOURKE L.J.

Form type M1

1797. APOSTOLATOS Peter

Form type M1

1798. MERHI Ida

Form type M1

1799. FRANCOS Patrick

Form type M1

1800. GORDON-PATRIDANON Susan

Form type M1

1801. JONES B.

Form type M1

1802. ANN R.

Form type M1

1803. SEBY Darren

Form type M1

1804. ETHERINGTON C.

Form type M1

1805. BOYLAND Jim

Form type M1

1806. BOND Clint

Form type M1

1807. TODD Bruce

Form type M1

1808. BRODIE Jim

Form type M1

1809. BLATIMAN J.

Form type M1

1810. CARTWRIGHT Steven

Form type M1

1811. JACOB Donna

Form type M1

1812. KOFE S.

Form type M1

1813. ZAHRA Emmanuel

Form type M1

1814. LITVER R.

Form type M1

1815. BLACKHURST E.

Form type M1

1816. SOLOMON Gina

Form type M1

1817. HAGARTY Scott

Form type M1

1818. URQUHART Niall

Form type M1

1819. RANKIN J.

Form type M1

1820. GABARA Kama

Form type M1

1821. ILLEGIBLE Joe

Form type M1

1822. GWYER Keith

Form type M1

1823. HARRIS Peter

Form type M1

1824. COX Vincent

Form type M1

1825. HOLDER P.S.

Form type M1

1826. ALLEN S.J.

Form type M1

1827. CARMODY L.

Form type M1

1828. HARCOURT D.

Form type M1

1829. HORTON Stewart

Form type M1

1830. MEDBURY Karina

Form type M1

1831. MORRIS Ian

Form type M1

1832. NORIEGA Jose

Form type M1

1833. JAMES S.

Form type M1

1834. NOLAN Jason

Form type M1

1835. URBAN K.

Form type M1

1836. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

1837. ORFANCE Taxoula

Form type M1

1838. SAVUOCAKIS Johnny

Form type M1

1839. ARAPIOU Helen

Form type M1

1840. ARAPIOU G.

Form type M1

1841. SORBY R.A.

Form type M1

1842. REES Colette

Form type M1

1843. HICKLETON J.A.

Form type M1

1844. BAIN K.

Form type M1

1845. KEHRNEY Eoghunc P.

Form type M1

1846. GOLSKI Michael

Form type M1

1847. ANDREASEN G.

Form type M1

1848. SHELDON J.

Form type M1

1849. GOWANS Kirsty

Form type M1

1850. COOPER Julie

Form type M1

1851. FREEMAN E.E.

Form type M1

1852. SPIEMAN Ron

Form type M1

1853. DELOUGHERY J.

Form type M1

1854. WILSON Hugh

Form type M1

1855. WALKER Judith

Form type M1

1856. McCUDDEN Isabel

Form type M1

1857. MOES Paula

Form type M1

1858. JOHNS Maria

Form type M1

1859. O'SULLIVAN Cadilte

Form type M1

1860. PEOPLES Emily

Form type M1

1861. PEOPLES Philipa

Form type M1

1862. PEOPLES W.

Form type M1

1863. PEOPLES Lucy

Form type M1

1864. WHEATLEY Wayne

Form type M1

1865. PEOPLES Patrick

Form type M1

1866. POYNTON T.D.

Form type M1

1867. FRASER Anne

Form type M1

1868. PASSMORE R.

Form type M1

1869. NICHOLAS Ross

Form type M1

1870. VISALLI A.

Form type M1

1871. MANSELL Linda

Form type M1

1872. CAPEL D.G.

Form type M1

1873. BLAKE F.

Form type M1

1874. CAPEL S.D.

Form type M1

1875. WILKINSON F.

Form type M1

1876. GERDEIRAS Antonio

Form type M1

1877. NEDELJKOVIC P.

Form type M1

1878. NEDELJKOVIC Aleksandra

Form type M1

1879. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

1880. O'REILLY R.

Form type M1

1881. TSOUKATES C.

Form type M1

1882. THACKER G.

Form type M1

1883. PSAROS J.

Form type M1

1884. O'REILLY Jennifer

Form type M1

1885. HIGGINS Robbie

Form type M1

1886. MAGUIRE F.

Form type M1

1887. VAN VAC Rachael

Form type M1

1888. DACOSTA Maria

Form type M1

1889. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

1890. FINOCCHIARDO Tina

Form type M1

1891. FINOCCHIARDO Frances

Form type M1

1892. CORBERT Edward

Form type M1

1893. VANE-TEMPEST Clare

Form type M1

1894. LYNCH Reg

Form type M1

1895. PRATS George

Form type M1

1896. PON Phillip

Form type M1

1897. ROACH M.

Form type M1

1898. NELSON P.S.

Form type M1

1899. NELSON K.N.

Form type M1

1900. BELL John

Form type M1

1901. ZIDARIC L.

Form type M1

1902. BANKS P.

Form type M1

1903. FLYNN Brendon

Form type M1

1904. MORTON Antoinette

Form type M1

1905. EDWARDS N.

Form type M1

1906. OWEN Morgan

Form type M1

1907. PHERASEMIUK I.

Form type M1

1908. RAISS E.F. and Liliam

Form type M1

1909. OKAYANE Hifei

Form type M1

1910. CAV D.

Form type M1

1911. LEE A.

Form type M1

1912. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

1913. MACKAY S.

Form type L3

1914. DESHPANDE Vinita

Form type L3

1915. McDOUGALL A.

Form type L3

1916. RONE R.

Form type L3

1917. McLAUGHLIN reg

Form type L3

1918. MOUNSEY K.

Form type L3

1919. MOROSIN J.

Form type L3

1920. SCHOMBELG Kurt

Form type L3

1921. DAM

Form type L3

1922. GOULD G.M.

Form type L3

1923. BEECH Daniel

Form type L3

1924. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L3

1925. RADOVNIKOVIC A.

Form type L3

1926. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L3

1927. KHUTH D.

Form type L3

1928. LAGIADIS S.

Form type L3

1929. SOMMAY S.

Form type L3

1930. GAAT T.

Form type L3

1931. GRIFFIN Neil

Form type L3

1932. BITO Janet

Form type L3

1933. LA Lucy

Form type L3

1934. ZHANG G.

Form type L3

1935. ILIC P.

Form type L3

1936. BROCKMANN T.

Form type L3

1937. DE SANTIS Eua

Form type L3

1938. SCARF Charlotte

Form type L3

1939. EARLE S.

Form type L3

1940. MANN Lee

Form type L3

1941. BUSH Ian

Form type L3

1942. CARTER Sky

Form type L3

1943. DAWES E.

Form type L3

1944. MARSDEN Aaron

Form type L3

1945. BOMNI Angelo

Form type L3

1946. DORUHAN M.

Form type L3

1947. HAWKER Ben

Form type L3

1948. LANDMAN Peta

Form type L3

1949. MADOER A.

Form type L3

1950. DEHAAS Y.

- There should be no toll collected.

1951. MASTERS M.L.

Form type L3

1928. LAGIADIS S.

Form type L3

1929. SOMMAY S.

Form type L3

1930. GAAT T.

Form type L3

1931. GRIFFIN Neil

Form type L3

1932. BITO Janet

Form type L3

1933. LA Lucy

Form type L3

1934. ZHANG G.

Form type L3

1935. ILIC P.

Form type L3

1936. BROCKMANN T.

Form type L3

1937. DE SANTIS Eua

Form type L3

1938. SCARF Charlotte

Form type L3

1939. EARLE S.

Form type L3

1940. MANN Lee

Form type L3

1941. BUSH Ian

Form type L3

1942. CARTER Sky

Form type L3

1943. DAWES E.

Form type L3

1944. MARSDEN Aaron

Form type L3

1945. BOMNI Angelo

Form type L3

1946. DORUHAN M.

Form type L3

1947. HAWKER Ben

Form type L3

1948. LANDMAN Peta

Form type L3

1949. MADOER A.

Form type L3

1950. DEHAAS Y.

- There should be no toll collected.

1951. MASTERS M.L.

Form type L3

1928. LAGIADIS S.

Form type L3

1929. SOMMAY S.

Form type L3

1930. GAAT T.

Form type L3

1931. GRIFFIN Neil

Form type L3

1932. BITO Janet

Form type L3

1933. LA Lucy

Form type L3

1934. ZHANG G.

Form type L3

1935. ILIC P.

Form type L3

1936. BROCKMANN T.

Form type L3

1937. DE SANTIS Eua

Form type L3

1938. SCARF Charlotte

Form type L3

1939. EARLE S.

Form type L3

1940. MANN Lee

Form type L3

1941. BUSH Ian

Form type L3

1942. CARTER Sky

Form type L3

1943. DAWES E.

Form type L3

1944. MARSDEN Aaron

Form type L3

1945. BOMNI Angelo

Form type L3

1946. DORUHAN M.

Form type L3

1947. HAWKER Ben

Form type L3

1948. LANDMAN Peta

Form type L3

1949. MADOER A.

Form type L3

1950. DEHAAS Y.

- There should be no toll collected.

1951. MASTERS M.L.

Form type L3

1928. LAGIADIS S.

Form type L3

1929. SOMMAY S.

Form type L3

1930. GAAT T.

Form type L3

1931. GRIFFIN Neil

Form type L3

1932. BITO Janet

Form type L3

1933. LA Lucy

Form type L3

1934. ZHANG G.

Form type L3

1935. ILIC P.

Form type L3

1936. BROCKMANN T.

Form type L3

1937. DE SANTIS Eua

Form type L3

1938. SCARF Charlotte

Form type L3

1939. EARLE S.

Form type L3

1940. MANN Lee

Form type L3

1941. BUSH Ian

Form type L3

1942. CARTER Sky

Form type L3

1943. DAWES E.

Form type L3

1944. MARSDEN Aaron

Form type L3

1945. BOMNI Angelo

Form type L3

1946. DORUHAN M.

Form type L3

1947. HAWKER Ben

Form type L3

1948. LANDMAN Peta

Form type L3

1949. MADOER A.

Form type L3

1950. DEHAAS Y.

- There should be no toll collected.

1951. MASTERS M.L.

Form type L3

1952. TRIBE Daniel

Form type L3

1953. SPEER Jonathon

Form type L3

1954. BANKS R.M.

Form type L3

1955. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L3

1956. TURNER H.E.

Form type L3

1957. COTTER H.

Form type L3

1958. TZANNES Alec

Form type L3

1959. PHELAN Ray

Form type L3

1960. FLENLEY Sarah

Form type L3

1961. WEBB Peter

Form type L3

1962. BATES Simon

Form type L3

1963. MUNRO Ewan

Form type L3

1964. HORNE G.

Form type L3

1965. CRAWLEY Vera

Form type L3

1966. WEINSTEIN R.

Form type L3

1967. BOWIE Anne

Form type L3

1968. LISZTES R.

Form type L3

1969. MERRICK J.

Form type L3

1970. JONES Danielle

Form type L3

1971. GRIEP Babette

Form type L3

1972. GULLIVER K.

Form type L3

1973. DA COSTA R.

Form type L3

1974. LONGRIDGE S.

Form type L3

1975. CON Tom

Form type L3

1976. GOOD L.

Form type L3

1977. BUCKLEY Kay

Form type L3

1978. HUGHES Andrew

Form type L3

1979. MORTIN Simon

Form type L3

1980. MASTERS Eliot

Form type L3

1981. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L3

1982. COEVORDEN David Van

Form type L3

1983. CHAN J.

Form type L3

1984. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L3

1985. THOMPSON D.

Form type L3

1986. MARCELLS G.

Form type L3

1987. McNEIL F.

Form type L3

1988. GRIMES D.

Form type L3

1989. IANSON Dean

Form type L3

1990. SIMONETIC R.

Form type L3

1991. BELAKHOV M.

Form type L3

1992. PECINA Vladimir

Form type L3 & D

1993. SAWKA C.J.

Form type L3

1994. GREENWOOD N.

Form type L3

1995. RUSSELL Gerard

Form type L3

1996. COTTERELL Frank

Form type L3 & D

1997. COTTERELL L.

Form type L3

1998. TANS L.

Form type L3

1999. COYLE Kylie

Form type L3

2000. O'BRIEN Suzanne

Form type L3

2000. O'BRIEN Suzanne

Form type L3

2001. CHRISOSTOMOS S.

Form type L3

2002. FRANICH Damir

Form type L3

2003. GOULD Scott

Form type L3

2004. WILLIAMS C.

Form type L3

2005. VISSER M.

Form type L3

2006. NEHME J.

Form type L3

2007. MINACA Romeo

Form type L3

2008. ERACE Diana

Form type L3

2009. FENECH Joe

Form type L3

2010. PANALDSON Jane

Form type L3

2011. SINNOTT Joan

Form type L3

2012. DONOGHUE B.

Form type L3

2013. HOWARD E.

Form type L3

2014. TALLE Tony

Form type L3

2015. ROSS David

Form type L3

2016. DOYLE Janet

Form type L3

2017. ROSE J.

Form type L3

2018. ADAMOU M.

Form type L3

2019. ADAMOU A.

Form type L3

2020. CARVANA Adam

Form type L3

2021. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L3

2022. PEARSON Evan

Form type L3

2023. DOHERTY D.

Form type L3

2024. BELCHER Darrin

Form type L3

2025. MORRIS Catherine

Form type L3

2026. CAMERON Mark

Form type L3

2027. LENNOX Kara

Form type L3

2028. GLYNN M.

Form type L3

2029. BAHAN Mr

Form type L3

2030. NIGAM Anish

Form type L3

2031. CROHE Lily

Form type L3

2032. SPENCER W.

Form type L3

2033. JACKSON Alistair

Form type L3

2034. WILLIS Doug

Form type L3

2035. BAXTER M.

Form type L3

2036. HEWETT Ben

Form type L3

2037. SIMMONDS Hilary

Form type L3

2038. BADHAM M.

Form type L3

2039. DAVIS Merewyn

Form type L3

2040. WILSON Glenn

Form type L3

2041. MURPHY Peter

Form type L3

2042. HOWARD Andrew

Form type L3

2043. TEIXEIRA Pedro

Form type L3

2044. SKINNER Kylie

Form type L3

2045. SAADAN Miguel

Form type L3

2046. SPECR Milton

Form type L3

2047. CAMPBELL Donna

Form type L3

2048. COULOURIS Theo

Form type L3

2049. COHITE Antoinette

Form type L3

2050. ATKINSON M.

Form type L3

2051. HINE K.

Form type L3

2052. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L3

2053. FRANCIS S.

Form type L3

2054. FARRUGIN Leo

Form type L3

2055. WESTON Peter

Form type L3

2056. BOTIS Trudi

Form type L3

2057. HOBSON D. M.

Form type L3

2058. CHURCHLAND L.

Form type L3

2059. CHURCHLAND D.

Form type L3

2060. SAUNDERS Annette

Form type L3

2061. MEKUDA M. A.

Form type L3

2062. BROWN-WATT C. A.

Form type L3

2063. CARIANA Peter

Form type L3

2064. TOBIN C. A.

Form type L3

2065. MILDEVHALL M.

Form type L3

2066. ARNALL Viera

Form type L3

2067. ARNOLD C.

Form type L3

2068. BELL Martin

Form type L3

2069. ARNALL Richard

Form type L3

2070. CORMIER Andrea

Form type L3

2071. SELF Nader

Form type L3

2072. LEE Sharon

Form type L3

2073. LOCHTENBERG Michael

Form type L3

2074. SEALY Bob

Form type L3

2075. BUTLER R.

Form type L3

2076. GUEST R. L.

Form type L3

2077. RICKARD M.

Form type L3

2078. THOMSEN J. U.

Form type L3

2079. SYKES E.

Form type L3

2080. MILLS Craig

Form type L3

2081. ORESKOVIC Joe

Form type L3

2082. PAISLEY Dr P. B.

Form type L3

2083. RONAN R. J.

Form type L3

2084. GRIFFITHS James and LEIGH D. E.

Form type L3

2085. CAVANAGH M.

Form type L3

2086. THOMAS Geoff

Form type L3

2087. LABANCE P.

Form type L3

2088. SMITH Margaret

Form type L3

2089. OSECKAS John

Form type L3

2090. HOLTOM P. A.

Form type L3

2091. KEMP Martin

Form type L3

2092. DESYDA John

Form type L3

2093. WALKER Ros

Form type L3

2094. DEVIR Vera

Form type L3

2095. WHITTAKR David

Form type L3

2096. MERCADER Anthony

Form type L3

2097. CONNELL R.

Form type L3

2098. RUMSEY A.

Form type L3

2099. DUNLOP Stefon

Form type L3

2100. THOMAS C Preston

Form type L3

2101. CURRIE Robyn

Form type L3

2102. GORDON Duncan

Form type L3

2103. GREEN Lisa

Form type L3

2104. MATTHEWS J. C.

Form type L3

2105. ROBINSON S. H.

Form type L3

2106. CLEARY Diane

Form type L3

2107. SANCHEZ Jane

Form type L3

2108. QUINNELL B.

Form type L3

2109. THACKER B.

Form type L3

2110. KALLARAS T.

Form type M1

2111. ALFONSO Peter

Form type M1

2112. CHAMBERS L.

Form type M1

2113. PAISREY Nicola

Form type M1

2114. NEAL M. J.

Form type M1

2115. WILLEST R.

Form type M1

2116. HILL J. G.

Form type M1

2117. COURCIER William

Form type M1

2118. FLEMING J. H.

Form type M1

2119. ILLEGIBLE Sebastian

Form type M1

2120. PETRO Violette

Form type M1

2121. PARTRIDGE K.

Form type M1

2122. GRUSCUIN P.

Form type M1

2123. MICALLEF G.

Form type M1

2124. ALEXANDER C.

Form type M1

2125. TAYLOR Karen

Form type M1

2126. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2127. HOWES Andrew

Form type M1

2128. O'NEILL P.

Form type M1

2129. JONES Kate

Form type D

2130. McCAM Kerry

Form type D

2131. BURNS Sophie

Form type D

2132. WHITTON Brad

Form type D

2133. BRAUN Nicole

Form type D

2134. DULEE M.

Form type D

2135. EASEY Nicole

Form type D

2136. KURNIAWAN Surjati

Form type D

2137. GORDON Rosemary

Form type D

2138. REED Melissa

Form type D

2139. NADIN Kim

Form type D

2140. DEAN Henry

Form type D

2141. CHARTRES Sarah

Form type D

2142. RIUETT Stephen

Form type D

2143. TOWNS Patricia

Form type D

2144. CARLISLE J.

Form type L1

2145. CLADAKIS P.

Form type L1

2146. CLADAKIS E.

Form type L1

2147. ILLEGIBLE Marsha

Form type L1

2148. FITZGERALD Julie

Form type L1

2149. BROWN Wayne

Form type L1

2150. DAVIS Felicity

Form type L1

2151. WARINE E.

Form type L3

2152. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L3

2153. WHITE Alison

Form type L3

2154. BLACK I. D.

Form type L3

2155. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L3

2156. CRANEY A.

Form type L3

2157. PATSELIS Bill

Form type L3

2158. BLUETT R.

Form type L3

2159. MORGAN Gaznar

Form type L3

2160. JONES Judith A.

Form type L3

2161. JONES Keith R.

Form type L3

2162. GEORGE J.

Form type L3

2163. KING L.

Form type L3

2164. EDWARDS

Form type L3

2165. SMITH Martin

Form type L3

2166. MARCONNET Laurence

Form type M1

2167. GOULDREY Chris

Form type M1

2168. CARROLL P. R.

Form type M1

2169. BURTON, Stephen M.

Form type M1

2170. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2171. LEONG A. W. C.

Form type M1

2172. HOUGHTEN C.

Form type M1

2173. EATHER Charles

Form type M1

2174. ASCIAK Emil

Form type M1

2175. DAVIS Helen

Form type M1

2176. MADDOCKS Lisa

Form type M1

2177. HARRISON S. J.

Form type M1

2178. SALVATORE Domenico and DUNN

Form type M1

2179. OLSON Neil

Form type M1

2180. TODD Foun

Form type M1

2181. DRUMMOND Tommy

Form type M1

2182. KABLE Vicki

Form type M1

2183. CIAPPARA Rita

Form type M1

2184. DRAKE D.

Form type M1

2185. WAIDOTAS Beata

Form type M1

2186. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2187. JOSEPH R.

Form type M1

2188. SINGH Kartar

Form type M1

2189. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2190. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2191. KOWALCZYK K.

Form type M1

2192. OFFER

Form type M1

2193. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2194. STURZMA K.

Form type M1

2195. CLARK Karina

Form type M1

2196. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2197. NASSET Paul

Form type M1

2198. BLAKE John

Form type M1

2199. SWEENEY Kate

Form type M1

2200. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2201. DAVIS W. G.

Form type M1

2202. RICHARDS V.

Form type M1

2203. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2204. YILMAR Murat

Form type M1

2205. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1

2206. STANLEY Paul

Form type M1

2207. SIMON Angela

Form type M1

2208. BATH W.

Form type M1

2209. KOOPER Philip

Form type M1

2210. COASTAR John

Form type M1

2211. HARVEY Karen

Form type M1

2212. DRAPER Glen, Ronald

Form type M1

2213. RICHARDSOME

Form type M1

2214. PEON Gloria

Form type M1

2215. BURTON R.

Form type M1

2216. BURTON Lisa

Form type M1

2217. BURTON J. M.

Form type M1

2218. RENWICK S.

Form type M1

2219. DAMIANOPOULOS Andrew

Form type M1

2220. HORDER Glenn

Form type M1

2221. DAVIES Anthony

Form type M1

2222. ATKINA Ali

Form type M1

2223. CATON S.

Form type M1

2224. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2225. CARREIRA Jose M.

Form type L2

2226. MERRALL N.

Form type L2

2227. JONES R.

Form type L2

2228. WILD Tony

Form type L2

2229. GRAY Vanessa

Form type L2

2230. KOCYAN Robert

Form type L2

2231. THORPE Trudi

Form type L2

2232. BRYDEN S.

Form type L2

2233. ANONYMOUS

Form type L2

2234. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2235. WOODS D.

Form type L2

2236. TRANT J.

Form type L2

2237. HURWITZ Celia

Form type L2

2238. GRANT T.

Form type L2

2239. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2240. LINDSAY Kerry A.

Form type L2

2241. MAGEE Debra

Form type L2

2242. EDWARDS Karin

Form type L2

2243. SPILLER Frank

Form type L2

2244. SMEE N.

Form type L2

2245. FANG Robin

Form type L2

2246. FAIRHURST Ross

Form type L2

2247. STYLES D.

Form type L2

2248. HEATON D.

Form type L2

2249. LOMERGAM J.

Form type L2

2250. KEMP Nadia

Form type L2

2251. WELFARE Dominic

Form type L2

2252. SMILES Simon

Form type L2

2253. POTTS David

Form type L2

2254. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2255. TURNER Adrian

Form type L2

2256. QUIRK J. B.

Form type L2

2257. BUNT K.

Form type L2

2258. MICALLEF P.

Form type L2

2259. PENIRIS C.

Form type L2

2260. CLARK J.

Form type L2

2261. ILLEGIBLE Jim

Form type L2

2262. ABBA Herick

Form type L2

2263. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2264. MARREE Olivia

Form type L2

2265. RICHARDS H.

Form type L2

2266. WYATT Michael

Form type L2

2267. DICKESON B. C.

Form type L2

2268. POWER Murray

Form type L2

2269. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2270. JACQUES Virginia

Form type L2

2271. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2272. BEGG Amanda

Form type L2

2273. SLATER S.

Form type L2

2274. EVANS Josh

Form type L2

2275. EVANS Tiff

Form type L2

2276. BRYANT Clare

Form type L2

2277. BEASLEY Martha

Form type L2

2278. THOMAS J. M.

Form type L2

2279. MARTIN J.

Form type L2

2280. MARTIN A.

Form type L2

2281. KING Melissa

Form type L2

2282. VARLEY Glen

Form type L2

2283. ATKIS Renata

Form type L2

2284. HARRIS C.

Form type L2

2285. WINLEY Tony

Form type L2

2286. WOOLLEY Jane

Form type L2

2287. ILLEGIBLE Joy

Form type L2

2288. BERCIMAN Ann L.

Form type L2

2289. ADLER Garry

Form type L2

2290. O'BRIAN Sean

Form type L2

2291. ROBINSON M. C.

Form type L2

2292. BUGESA E.

Form type L2

2293. ILLEGIBLE Richard

Form type L2

2294. TANSEY Jean

Form type L2

2295. SMITH L. J.

Form type L2

2296. GRIFFITHS K.

Form type L2

2297. ILLEGIBLE J.

Form type L2

2298. PRICE G.

Form type L2

2299. PHELAW Martin

Form type L2

2300. JACKSON Lynne

Form type L2

2301. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2302. RYAN P. K.

Form type L2

2303. GREENHALCH Marie-Louise

Form type L2

2304. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2305. MARR Stuart and BULDDRINI A.

Form type L

2306. WARD Clive A. P.

Form type L

2307. TAYLOR D.

Form type L

2308. NAWGLE James

Form type L

2309. McNAMARA Tim

Form type L

2310. SPENCER Louise

Form type L

2311. DEVINE D.

Form type L

2312. DEVINE B.

Form type L

2313. DEVINE L.

Form type L

2314. BELL M.

Form type L

2315. GYLES Catherine

Form type L

2316. GYLES Lachlan

Form type L

2317. MANIQUANT Saula

Form type L2

2318. WALKER Robert

Form type L2

2319. HAVEKES Louise

Form type L

2320. DONOGHUE C.

Form type L

2321. FUAGE G. B.

Form type L

2322. NARAYAN Satya

Form type L

2323. ILLEGIBLE Andrew

Form type L

2324. WALTERS Angela

Form type L

2325. CONCEICAO I. R.

Form type L

2326. RITCHIE Tim

Form type L

2327. MAGRATH J. A.

Form type L

2328. NAGY Tibor

Form type L2

2329. LOWER Geoff

Form type L2

2330. JORDAN Minette

Form type L2

2331. DALEY Philip

Form type L2

2332. CARLTON P. J.

Form type L2

2333. COCKLE Garry

Form type L2

2334. CAMERON S.

Form type L2

2335. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L2

2336. ILLEGIBLE Jane M.

Form type L2

2337. ILLEGIBLE Fiona

Form type L2

2338. YOUNG M.

Form type L2

2339. LAI S.

Form type L2

2340. BALL Anay J.

Form type L2

2341. SMITH C.

Form type L2

2342. ILLEGIBLE Matthew

Form type L2

2343. SAFSTROM Anna

Form type L2

2344. ILLEGIBLE A.

Form type L2

2345. JOSE R. N.

Form type L

2346. PLUMMER Aileen

Form type L

2347. VOET Simone

Form type L

2348. HORDERN J. M.

Form type L

2349. MACFIE R. B.

Form type L

2350. JERICHO Matthew

Form type L

2351. MINUTELLO Nick

Form type L

2352. ROBILLIARD Paul

Form type L

2353. AMOR Peter

Form type L

2354. GREIG Tim

Form type L

2355. MORRIS Virginia

Form type L

2356. KITTY M.

Form type L

2357. MANSFIELD A. J.

Form type L

2358. LAMONT R. A.

Form type L

2359. RAJCHERT Alison

Form type L

2360. RAJCHERT John

Form type L

2361. FORSTER Peta

Form type L

2362. ANDERSON Mark

Form type L

2363. WALMSLEY A.

Form type L

2364. COOREY G. J. F.

Form type L

2365. CORBETT Philip

Form type L

2366. TROW Valerie

Form type L

2367. DAVIS Betty E.

Form type L

2368. VONWWILLER

Form type L

2369. ROY Claudette

Form type L

2370. DORWARD Dennis John

Form type L

2371. COSTELLO John

Form type L

2372. SHAW P.

Form type L

2373. SMITH Stefan

Form type L

2374. LEAKEY Borghild

Form type L

2375. LEAKEY W. M.

Form type L

2376. SAWERS Sham

Form type L

2377. GRIFFITH Paul

Form type L

2378. ILLEGIBLE Catherine

Form type L

2379. BERR Johana

Form type L

2380. BUTLER Andrew

Form type L

2381. DAVIS Bridget

Form type L

2382. BLOXSON Jan

Form type L

2383. POWELL Clifton

Form type L

2384. ALLEN Maureen

Form type L

2385. ALLEN E. F.

Form type L

2386. ARPADI R. A.

Form type L2

2387. REEVES F.

Form type L2

2388. SEUNG Ha

Form type L2

2389. ILLEGIBLE Kelly

Form type L2

2390. MOORE Robert W.

Form type L2

2391. PATON C.

Form type L2

2392. TANK David

Form type L2

2393. ILLEGIBLE David

Form type L2

2394. PAYNE J.

Form type L

2395. OSIS V.

Form type L

2396. TRIBE Peter

Form type L

2397. NORMAN J.

Form type L

2398. RICHARDS E.

Form type L

2399. COOPER Jay

Form type L

2400. LAKISS-SMITH R.

Form type L

2401. LAKISS-SMITH R. Mrs

Form type L

2402. SOTIRIOS George

Form type L

2403. CRAWFORD Fiona

Form type L

2404. REANDOR K.

Form type L

2405. REANDON K.

Form type L

2406. HARRIS J.

Form type L

2407. JOHNSON Wendy

Form type L

2408. JOHNSON Emma

Form type L

2409. JOHNSON Alex

Form type L

2410. LENNAN Gary

Form type L

2411. DeBRITO Kate

Form type L

2412. PETERS J.

Form type L2

2413. MORRIS M.

Form type L2

2414. SCHREURS Desiree

Form type L2

2415. ILLEGIBLE B.

Form type L

2416. MA Brenda

Form type L2

2417. RANKIN A.

Form type L

2418. SIMMONDS R. M.

Form type L

2419. KELL Janice

Form type L2

2420. TANKER P.

Form type L2

2421. WOODFORDE Eric

Form type L

2422. OATES C. C.

Form type L

2423. HARRIS Jodie

Form type L

2424. LIGHTFOOT L. K.

Form type L

2425. BENINGTON J. L.

Form type L

2426. LEECH Erina

Form type L

2427. McMILLAN

Form type L

2428. ILLEGIBLE L.

Form type L

2429. SAUNDERS Katy

Form type L

2430. STODDAND L.

Form type L

2431. PRICE N.

Form type L

2432. DODD A.

Form type L

2433. LEECH Graham

Form type L

2434. TARLAO Nancy

Form type L

2435. HOFFMANN Michael

Form type L

2436. TARLAO Beatrice

Form type L

2437. LANEY Ian W.

Form type L

2438. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

2439. RICHMOND Laetitia

Form type L

2440. SCHRIEVER Ray

Form type L

2441. VANDERPLIGHT Karen

Form type L

2442. LEE S. J.

Form type L

2443. AQUILINA E.

Form type L

2444. AQUILINA E.

Form type L

2445. SMITH Emanuel

Form type L

2446. MALCOLM D. F.

Form type L

2447. ILLEGIBLE Margaret

Form type L

2448. PEELGRANE Sara

Form type L

2449. ILLEGIBLE D.

Form type L

2450. JACKSON M.

Form type L

2451. BISBY Paul

Form type L

2452. PALMER Kevin N.

Form type L

2453. McDONOUGH B. A.

Form type L

2454. SAVILLE Glenda

Form type L

2455. ILLEGIBLE D. H.

Form type L

2456. PHILIPONA P.

Form type L

2457. KITCHEN Sandy

Form type L

2458. PETERS Lola

Form type L

2459. ILLEGIBLE M.

Form type L

2460. KYPREDS Stephen

Form type L

2461. FAZEKAS Anna

Form type L

2462. McKENZIE Alison

Form type L

2463. MORRISON N.

Form type L

2464. KNIGHT Richard

Form type L

2465. ILLEGIBLE M.

Form type L

2466. QUINN David

Form type L

2467. WHEDDON S.

Form type L

2468. EDGERTON John

Form type L

2469. ELSLEY Melissa

Form type L

2470. ILLEGIBLE Richard

Form type L

2471. BEL-BACHIR G.

Form type L

2472. BEL-BACHIR Ginette

Form type L

2473. SMYTH D.

Form type L

2474. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

2475. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L

2476. EWEN David

Form type L

2477. EWEN Amy

Form type L

2478. BARWELL B.

Form type L

2479. ILLEGIBLE Lisa

Form type L

2480. RANLEY M.

Form type L

2481. PETROV Katina

Form type L

2482. OLDAKER Daryl

Form type L

2483. ILLEGIBLE Veronique

Form type L

2484. NASH Loretta

Form type L

2485. KING John M.

Form type L

2486. PETROV Vicky

Form type L

2487. WALTON

Form type L2

2488. CHERNOFF Michael

Form type L2

2489. CHI Louis

Form type L2

2490. HARRIS M.

Form type L

2491. VINCENT Aspin S.

Form type L

2492. LUKE E.

Form type L

2493. REGAN Glenn

Form type L

2494. CONNOLLY John

Form type L2

2495. THOMSON

Form type L2

2496. MAITLAND Susan

Form type L2

2497. TAHAR P.

Form type L2

2498. SPUCYS L.

Form type L2

2499. INGRAM Stephen

Form type L2

2500. ELEFOTHERLOO John

Form type L2

2501. SCOTT Chris

Form type L2

2502. BAORONG Liang

Form type L2

2503. GRASSY Peter

Form type L2

2504. FINUCANE C.

Form type L2

2505. RAYMENT E.

Form type L2

2506. GAY Megan

Form type L2

2507. GAY Brian

Form type L

2508. DIXON K.

Form type L

2509. ILLEGIBLE Wendy

Form type L

2510. WALTERS Rob

Form type L

2511. McGILP James

Form type L

2512. DEVINE Jane

Form type L2

2513. LAWRENCE Lea

Form type L2

2514. BOUSIE Jaquelin

Form type L

2515. LECORNN Simon

Form type L2

2516. JOHNSTON Andrew

Form type L

2517. BOWMAN Alison

Form type L

2518. GRANT S.

Form type L

2519. MURRAY H.

Form type L

2520. WEYMARK Brett

Form type L

2521. POWELL S.

Form type L

2522. BAUMANN S.

Form type L

2523. SHELLEY B.

Form type L

2524. LAVOCAH G. M.

Form type L

2525. MORTON Taryn

Form type L

2526. SALMON L.

Form type L

2527. PACINO Virginia

Form type L

2528. PACINO Paul

Form type L

2529. SALMON H.

Form type L

2530. MICHAELS K.

Form type L

2531. ILLEGIBLE Pete

Form type L

2532. WIGLEY David

Form type L

2533. TUAN Ching-Mee

Form type L

2534. BULL Shane

Form type L

2535. ILLEGIBLE D.

Form type L

2536. ALUDRIEZ John

Form type L

2537. SCHAFER Stephen

Form type L

2538. KERRY Gordon

Form type L

2539. WUNSCH Ann

Form type L

2540. YOUNG William

Form type L

2541. MITCHELL Kathy

Form type L

2542. GILROY Kate

Form type L

2543. NIXON Ann

Form type L

2544. DONOVAN Helen

Form type L

2545. DONOVAN Mark

Form type L

2546. KAAD Amanda

Form type L

2547. SCOTT Mark

Form type L

2548. FLETCHER Mark

Form type L2

2549. LUIS David R.

Form type L2

2550. GRAHL A.

Form type L2

2551. HAMS E.

Form type L2

2552. HALL Sam

Form type L2

2553. ROBINSON Olivia

Form type L2

2554. FLETCHER Anthony

Form type L2

2555. WESNEY

Form type L2

2556. GARVAN Don

Form type L2

2557. CLARK John

Form type L

2558. LINDLEY Amelia

Form type L

2559. WISH J. F.

Form type L

2560. CARRICK John

Form type L

2561. DIPIRAMO Micaela

Form type L

2562. McCALLUM Chris

Form type L

2563. WARRAN D.

Form type L

2564. AVLARRADEL C.

Form type L

2565. LAMOUR Rebecca

Form type L

2566. OLAVA Tresia

Form type L

2567. GEORGARAI G.

Form type L

2568. ILLEGIBLE Steve

Form type L

2569. BEVERIDGE E.

Form type L

2570. MUELLER Kate

Form type L

2571. BARNABT Glen

Form type L

2572. GATES Neville

Form type L

2573. KOUSTOWLOUTAS Kathy

Form type L

2574. ZAMAGIAS K.

Form type L

2575. AVGOULIS A.

Form type L

2576. ZAMAGIAS C.

Form type L

2577. ZAMAGIAS A.

Form type L

2578. LOBO D. F.

Form type L

2579. RAINFORD S.

Form type L

2580. BOX Libby

Form type L

2581. CARUANA Joseph

Form type L

2582. O'BRIEN Josh

Form type M2

2583. DAMAS I.

Form type M2

2584. LILLIS Meg

Form type M2

2585. McCALLOM Stephen

Form type M2

2586. GRIFFITY Basil

Form type M2

2587. O'LOUGHLIN Shannon

Form type M2

2588. GOOD Rosa

Form type M2

2589. STATLUS Christian

Form type M2

2590. GALLAGHER Ryan

Form type M2

2591. ILLEGIBLE Phil

Form type M2

2592. BROWN Fiona

Form type M2

2593. SULIVAN Graeme

Form type M2

2594. TUCKER Alan

Form type M2

2595. PURSER Polly

Form type M2

2596. FORD Peter C.

Form type M2

2597. PUSKA Lisa

Form type M2

2598. ROHAN Dani

Form type M2

2599. TAYLOR S. O.

Form type M2

2600. PYROS Joanna

Form type M2

2601. HILL Trevor

Form type W

2602. JOHNSON A.

Form type W

2603. BROOKS Rodney

Form type W

2604. GALLAGHER G. W.

Form type W

2605. TROTTER Jay

Form type W

2606. TROTTER Alan

Form type W

2607. LEECH Charles Mark

Form type W

2608. MATTHEWS Mary

Form type W

2609. COLES Michael

Form type W

2610. SUMI Paul

Form type W

2611. BROWN B.

Form type W

2612. McCARRON Rachel

Form type W

2613. BROWN D.

Form type W

2614. BROWN Stephen

Form type W

2615. LIPPEL Barron

Form type W

2616. QUINN Glenn

Form type W

2617. PARKER Joel

Form type W

2618. CUNNINGHAM John

Form type L5

2619. HALE Rod

Form type L5

2620. CARRAS Julia

Form type L5

2621. WATERS Misty

Form type L5

2622. POSEN J.

Form type L5

2623. KOLL Walter

Form type L5

2624. WISDEN Eric

Form type L5

2625. MORGAN S.

Form type L5

2626. DE LAURENTIS Alexandria

Form type L5

2627. PEADY Linda

Form type L5

2628. STAVRAPOVLOS S.

Form type L5

2629. PEARCH R.

Form type L5

2630. SAUNDERS Peter

Form type L5

2631. BOURKE A. D.

Form type L5

2632. THOMAS B. I.

Form type L5

2633. POPOVICH A.

Form type L5

2634. ROMINA

Form type L5

2635. NOBBS A.

Form type L5

2636. SAWARY Mary E.

Form type L5

2637. SWAT Eddie

Form type L5

2638. PHELPS William

- The loss of 3 acres of parkland and public space to accommodate a motorway is unacceptable.
- The communities affected by the proposal have not had sufficient consultation nor access to various data during the pre-consultation process.
- Inducement of traffic to the route, results in a substantial increase of up to 250%, and is within metres from residential housing areas.
- Will create gridlock near Drivers Triangle.
- Should the Eastern Distributor proceed it must be underground, tunnelling from the Domain Tunnel to Link Rd, Kensington.
- Adverse effects to items of heritage and archaeological significance.
- Carcinogenic benzene contaminants and other pollution will increase over residential areas.
- Access and use of parklands will be impeded in Surry Hills, Redfern and Woolloomooloo. These areas are already lacking adequate green space within the residential areas.
- The large scale configuration and visual ugliness of the design of what is proposed for South Dowling St is unacceptable.
- Up to 10 lanes wide in many sections with differing elevations and cuttings. The poor design will degrade the appearance of the inner city, specifically Surry Hills, Moore Park and Redfern as the entrance to the City of Sydney.
- Elevated roadways will overshadow the Art Gallery and historic Woolloomooloo and eliminate the opportunity of open space within the city confines.
- Night time traffic noise is already a serious problem.
- Increase in truck movements, from Port Botany and the M5 will further affect what is in many cases an already impossible situation.
- Noise levels already exceed WHO standards by over 40db.
- Lack of Local Area Traffic Management plans within the EIS process to allow the community to see the effect of the proposed distributor to the local traffic management.

- East West traffic management generated by Sydney Football Stadium, Sydney Cricket Ground and FOX studios, and the large scale increase in population along the route, has not been given due consideration.
- Toll avoidance will adversely effect urban communities alongside the corridor.

2639. MURTOUGH P

Form type L5.

2640. DOBNER Robert

Form type L5.

2641. MICALLET C

Form type L5.

2642. TILLER Kerry E

Form type L5.

2643. ILLEGIBLE

Form type L5.

2644. CLEARY Susan

Form type L5.

2645. WHITTEMORE C.

Form type L5.

2646. TURNER L.

Form type L5.

2647. RODRIGO Russell

Form type L5.

2648. MORGAN Howard

Form type L5.

2649. BUKOVAC Verena

Form type L5.

2650. POULET Peter

Form type L5.

2651. MARTINO M.

Form type L5.

2652. WARD M.

Form type L5.

2653. BROUDO S.

Form type L5.

2654. JAANISTE Rein

Form type L5.

2655. YEOMAN Warrick

Form type L5.

2656. ILLEGIBLE Lawrence

Form type L5.

2657. BURTON Matthew

Form type L5.

2658. TRELOAR Jane

Form type L5.

2659. WATSO R. A.

Form type L5.

2660. BRAOUDAKIS George

- Concerned about increase in traffic on the existing regional and local road system in the inner city, Eastern suburbs, South-West Sydney and the north of the harbour.
- Patronage will be attracted away from public transport, particularly the New Southern Railway.
- Subject thousands more homes to increased levels of health-damaging traffic noise.
- The proposal would spoil the amenity of parks and recreational facilities.

2661. WILSON Jackie

Form type M.

2662. WILSON Scott

Form type L.

2663. CLARKE Sean

Form type L.

2664. FENTON Bob

Transport Action Group

- Concerned that patronage will be attracted away from the New Southern Railway.

- The decision to proceed with the Eastern Distributor will further destroy the environment of the local community.

2665. ILLEGIBLE

Form type M1.

2666. KENNEDY C.

Form type M1.

2667. BLAYLOCK J

- Will leave air quality matters to the experts, yet hope that these matters will be thoroughly investigated.
- Would like to see noise barriers placed in the centre of the roadway over the entire length of the Motorway.
- Has difficulty sleeping with the location of the lighting in the area. Would like to see 'hoods' placed over the lights to improve their direction, intensity and reduce the effects the lights have on adjacent residents.

2668. TESDORF Alex

Form type T

2669. ROGERS Pam

- Concerned about the amenity of the area being ruined by the Eastern Distributor project near the Opera House, and the development on Finger Wharf at Woolloomooloo. These developments should be demolished and replaced by 'green areas' including paths and walkways for pedestrians.

2670. TESDORF Karin Ann

Form type T

2671. MESSARA D R

- We already have the Cahill Expressway and the Western Distributor. Both are environmentally unfriendly and a social disaster, do not let us add to them.
- The Eastern Distributor serves Woolloomooloo from the city - and pedestrian bridges are not much use to the disabled.
- The Eastern Distributor cuts Surry Hills off from Moore Park - supposedly the lungs of that suburb.
- The Eastern Distributor ruins the Heritage Cityscape and destroys the amenity.
- Noise and air pollution will be intolerable for anybody living nearby.
- Frank Sartor's suggestion of putting the Woolloomooloo section underground is preferable. She believes the South Dowling St section should also be underground. It would obviously be more expensive to build, but she thinks the costs would be justifiable on social, environmental and heritage grounds.

2672. JOHNSON M

- Concerned about the possibility of a motorway to be built in continuation of the Cahill Expressway, with a raised eight lane road with tollways.
- Concerned about the air and noise pollution which will be produced from the construction of the Eastern Distributor.

2673. CALLARAN Elizabeth

- Strongly protests to the proposal to build an eight lane highway outside the Art Gallery.
- This area is important for many reasons; the peace; the beauty and the history.
- A motorway would surely create far more problems than it would solve, and it would be a permanent reminder of the poor judgement used.
- Investigation must be given to other alternatives.

2674. WATTS J and K

- Concerned about a tollway outside the Art Gallery of NSW.
- Frustrated and dismayed to think a freeway could impede upon this vital centre of our culture.

2675. PORTER M

- It does not seem reasonable to increase pollution in the air around an art gallery containing priceless art. To completely exclude the possibility of pollution destroying paintings would be impossible.
- The noise from the Eastern Distributor will destroy the peaceful and pleasant surroundings of the area around the NSW Art Gallery.
- The peaceful and pleasant surroundings of the area around the NSW Art Gallery are much used by tourists as well as local residents.
- Hyde Park, the Domain and Gardens area are the only areas we have for relaxation in the city.

2676. OHANA Judith

- Building more expressways will only encourage more and more cars into the city.
- The Eastern Distributor would have a major adverse impact on the amenity of the area around the Gallery, which is of great cultural and historical significance.
- Should seek a traffic solution which minimises the environmental effects on the area.
- It is time to look at ways of increasing the use of public transport to reduce air pollution in our city.

2677. ROSE Pamela

- It would be a great pity to destroy one of the most popular tourist destinations in Sydney. The Gallery is a very pleasant place to visit and you can enjoy the ambience of the Botanical Gardens and the Domain as well.
- Visitors to Sydney would rather see the Gallery, its views, the Gardens, the Domain and our old trees, rather than huge overhead roadways.
- The new road should go underground. Taxpayers would be happier to pay for an underground tunnel rather than a roadway which would create more problems than it would solve.

2678. TAYLOR Rhonda

- The Art Gallery building and the art collection itself deserve protection from pollution, as do the delights of our Gardens.

- Concerned about the threat of the Eastern Distributor to the very sensitive environment of the Art Gallery and the green area of the Botanic Gardens and the Domain.
- The Eastern Distributor will be a crass way out of our traffic problems, significantly harming the whole area, which is important to generations of Sydneysiders and visiting tourists.

2679. BANFIELD Jennifer

- Concerned that the Eastern Distributor will effect access to amenities such as the Art Gallery. The social impacts of this project are too great.

2680. ROBERTS K W

- The proposed tollway will impinge on the Art Gallery and the immediate area of Woolloomooloo.
- The associated works, signs, collection booths, etc., will further spoil the space between the Domain and the Botanic Gardens.

2681. LOANE D and S

- The proposal would destroy the area around the Art Gallery, Domain and the Botanic Garden. Alternatives should be considered so that the amenity of the area is maintained.

2682. SHEED J

- The State Government has just spent an enormous amount of money on the extensions to the Art Gallery of NSW, which is the most important popular cultural institution in the state. Spoiling it with an ill-considered highway extension would be a very bad political decision. Surely there are other alternatives for the traffic problem.

2683. RODGERS Kelly

- An eight lane raised highway should not be built in front of the Art Gallery . It is a price which should not be paid for the Olympic Games.

2684. WILLIAMS Lewis

- Many of our national heritage items will be adversely affected including our Art gallery, the Domain and the Botanic Gardens, all of which will have this 'blot on the landscape' created by the Motorway.

- The noise and noxious pollution caused by the Eastern Distributor will be a burden on the patronage of the Art Gallery Cafe.
- Feels the air pollution caused by the Eastern Distributor will have adverse effects on the Art Gallery and its sensitive contents.

2685. BLEAKLEY Robert
Sotheby's Australia Pty Limited

- The Eastern Distributor will bring a greater inflow of traffic into the city. Public transport should be the emphasis, rather than giving greater access to private automobiles.
- The Eastern Distributor will have a detrimental impact to the currently quiet precinct of the Art Gallery of NSW.

2686. KELLY K

- A more acceptable alternative should be considered rather than the proposed plan to construct an eight lane raised motorway adjoining the Art Gallery of NSW.
- The visual ugliness of this raised motorway will be horrific enough, but the resultant increased noise and pollution will be detrimental to the Art Gallery building, and as a result, extend to the priceless collections housed therein, in due course.
- It will also adversely impact on the surrounding domain, Botanic Gardens and parklands.

2687. COURCIER John

- Concerned about the long-term effect of the Eastern Distributor on the quality of life of the people of South Sydney through the loss of amenity caused by the volume of traffic degrading the area.
- Concerned about the degradation of the area by slashing a widened road from Woolloomooloo through Darlinghurst and Surry Hills to Waterloo.
- The only logical solution for the ED is a tunnel from the southern end of the Harbour Tunnel to Epsom Road, Alexandria, i.e. a full-length tunnel.
- Notes that there is a tunnel to be constructed for traffic presently using Park Lane in London. Residents will regain park land and lower noise level.

2688. McKEE Peter

- There is no question that the Art Gallery of NSW, Domain and Botanic Gardens will be disadvantaged immeasurably by the construction of this ghastly edifice. The creators of this alternative can only be described as Philistines. This is the sort of "solution" that put the Cahill Expressway in place.
- Approaching the 21st century, we have to be able to do better than this!

2689. MORGAN H

- Is it your object to make Sydney even uglier than it is now?
- This Harbour-side tollway is a disastrous piece of old-fashioned planning.
- Have you no engineers who can think beyond the ghastly Los Angeles-style solution to traffic?
- The ED should go underground, as it would be in any modern city.
- Why ruin one of the few peaceful areas of the city?
- The precinct of the Art Gallery will be ruined. Have you no care for citizens or tourists?

2690. WALSH Peter

Form type L.

2691. HALE J

Form type L.

2692. IWATA Takahiro

Form type L.

2693. KAKIS Nick

Form type L.

2694. HOLMES Bonita

Form type L.

2695. PIERSON Lynne

Form type L.

2696. MILLER John

Form type L.

2697. MILLING Katy

Form type L.

2698. KYPREO G

Form type L.

2699. GALE George

Form type L.

2700. FIESTER D

Form type L.

2701. MARLOW Honor

Form type L.

2702. LORING K

Form type L.

2703. DEADY Paul

Form type L.

2704. KEYS Thomas

Form type L.

2705. FREEMAN Phill

Form type M1.

2706. CLAYTON Andrew

Form type M1.

2707. McTAVISH S

Form type D.

2708. NEVON Margaret

Form type D.

2709. KELLY Melissa

Form type D.

2710. MONROE Kate

Form type D.

2711. BRADFIELD L

Form type D.

2712. ANONYMOUS

Form type D.

2713. MCNEIL F

Form type D.

2714. GRIMES D J

Form type D.

2715. PERSON Ray

Form type M1.

2716. JACKSON Sharon

- Concerned that property values around South Dowling Street will decrease as a result of the ED.

2717. KELLY Susan

- Alternatives to the raising and widening of the roadway should be considered to preserve the amenity of the sensitive environment around the Gallery and the Gardens.

2718. MAYNE Vinetta

- The amenity of the historically and culturally significant areas around the gallery (Domain, Botanic Gardens, Parklands, Woolloomooloo) will be degraded.
- Tollway construction will have a detrimental effect on the safety and sensitive conditions required by the Gallery and its collections. Its reputation will be placed in jeopardy by increased traffic, noise and pollution.

2719. HEYDON B

- The proposed tollway will impinge on the Art Gallery and the immediate area of Woolloomooloo. Our Gallery is "humming" with thousands of visitors.

2720. HERTZBERG Valda

- The proposed raised eight lane motorway close to the Art Gallery, would ruin the Art Gallery and the Botanic Gardens.
- The proposed raised eight lane motorway close to the Art Gallery should be placed underground to avoid impacts on the art gallery and botanic gardens.

2721. SCOTT J.C. WAINE

- The location of the Distributor close to the Art Gallery may impact the contents of the Art Gallery. The Art Gallery, its contents and location is a bastion for culture for future generations. It is appropriate that the gallery is located close to the city, unobstructed and its close proximity to the foreshore.

2722. HASKELL John

- The elevated roadway will affect the views from the Art Gallery.
- The elevated roadway will affect the immediate environment of the Art Gallery and the Domain.
- An alternative solution should be found to improve traffic flows on the southern end of the Cahill Expressway which is less intrusive and which is more compatible with visual, cultural and tourist needs.
- The elevated roadway will increase noise and air pollution.

2723. CROCKER H

- The elevated roadway will increase noise and air pollution.
- The CBD should be closed to private vehicles.
- The elevated roadway near the Art Gallery will destroy the ambience of the parklands, gardens and Art Gallery and historic area from Macquarie Street to St Mary's.
- The elevated roadway near the Art Gallery may damage the Art Gallery collection through construction vibration, noise and traffic vibration.
- The elevated roadway will affect the views from the Art Gallery.

2724. ESSON M

- The elevated roadway will affect the views from the Art Gallery.
- The Art Gallery houses overseas works of art and conditions for housing them are stringent. The proposed motorway will jeopardise these conditions by causing detriment to paintings and other art works due to noise, visual and chemical pollution. The Art Gallery is a significant cultural centre attracting visitors and the proposal may disadvantage these visitors.
- Alternatives such as an underground tunnel and surface landscaping should be considered to enhance the Art Gallery site and reduce risk to the existing collection.

Taxes should be looked at. Also to allow for some of the 12.5% Federal Tax to be decreased.

- The proposal should be put underground.

2733. BIDERBECK-FROST Mr & Mrs

Form type U

2734. DALE Elizabeth and Barry

- The raised road at the Art Gallery and the Botanic Gardens will constitute a major intrusion into the area and degrade the tranquillity of the area.
- Consideration should be given to sitting the roadway underground at the Art Gallery/Domain thereby protecting this sensitive environment.
- The proposed raised motorway close to the Art Gallery , the Domain and Botanic gardens would degrade the views to Woolloomooloo and the Harbour.
- The proposed raised motorway close to the Art Gallery , the Domain and Botanic gardens would be a blot on the landscape.

2735. ALLAN C

- The proposed raised motorway close to the Art Gallery will endanger the beauty and tranquillity surrounding the Art Gallery.

2736. GUY D.S. and C.H

- The proposed raised motorway close to the Art Gallery , the Domain and Botanic gardens should not proceed as this area is culturally and aesthetically important to Australian and overseas visitors.

2737. McCONNACHIE R

- The amenity of the historically and culturally significant areas around the gallery (Domain, Botanic Gardens, Parklands, Woolloomooloo) will be degraded.
- The Art Gallery is a tourist attraction. Overseas visitors remark on the unique quality of the Gallery and its environment.
- This attraction would be challenged by the proposal.

- ED will seriously disadvantage the historical significance of the area around the Art Gallery, Botanical Gardens, Domain Parklands and Woolloomooloo.
- Noise from the toll booths outside the Art Gallery will be at odds with the Gallery's aims and the visitors' expectations.
- Tollway construction will have a detrimental effect on the safety and sensitive conditions required by the Gallery and its collections. Its reputation will be place in jeopardy by increased traffic, noise and pollution
- Elevated roadway near the Art Gallery and Woolloomooloo would seriously compromise the visual amenity of this area.
- Views over Woolloomooloo Bay and the harbour would be obstructed.

2738. RIDD Susan

Form type U

- Considers the ambience of the Art Gallery coffee shop is special. The proposal would be a short sighted irreversible mistake.

2739. MARX P.W. and T.G. MEREDITH

- The proposed raised eight lane motorway will be a permanent blot on the Sydney environment. Sydney does not deserve or need another Cahill Expressway.
- The proposed raised eight lane motorway close will dislocate Woolloomooloo which is emerging as a dormitory area for Sydney.
- The Sydney City Council proposal for extending the tunnel to the Cahill Expressway should be adopted even if it costs more.

2740. BRAIN N.D.

- The proposed raised eight lane motorway close to the Art Gallery should be placed underground to avoid impacts on the art gallery.

2741. CRESDEE Ross

- The construction of the Eastern Distributor should be an opportunity to reduce local traffic on Todman and Doncaster Avenues. The proposal will encourage traffic to use these

2725. BRETT Betty

- The elevated roadway near the Art Gallery will be seen as a blot on the landscape during the Sydney Olympics.
- The elevated roadway will affect the views from the Art Gallery.
- The elevated roadway and noise pollution will affect the Art Gallery.
- The parklands of the Domain, Royal Botanic Gardens and areas in Woolloomooloo should not be used for the construction of the Distributor as proposed because this area is used by a large number of Sydney residents.
- The proposal will damage the sensitive environment of the Art Gallery which houses a world-class collection of paintings, drawings and other artefacts.

2726. BELL Janet

- The elevated roadway near the Art Gallery should be placed underground. If Optus and Telecom put their cables underground the same principle should be applied to the RTA.
- There is no way of knowing the detrimental effect the motorway will have on cultural icons such as the Art Gallery and surrounding environment.
- The Art Gallery is part of our heritage and attracts a variety of visitors and is a major tourist attraction. The proposal could affect the sensitive environment required to preserve works of art and may jeopardise the holding of major exhibitions.
- The proposal may lead to the closure of open areas of the Art Gallery such as the open air cafe.
- The elevated roadway will increase noise and air pollution.
- The elevated roadway will affect the views from the Art Gallery.

2727. ASPDEN Philip

- Opposed to a 8 lane motorway near the Art Gallery, the Domain and the Botanic Gardens as it shows a disregard for the cultural heritage of the area.

2729. FITZPATRICK Margaret

- Concerned about the damage caused by earth workings and industrial intervention to the Art Gallery.

- The proposed tollway will impinge on the Art Gallery and the immediate area of Woolloomooloo.
- The amenity of the historically and culturally significant areas around the gallery (Domain, Botanic Gardens, Parklands, Woolloomooloo) will be degraded.

2730. ANDERSON Barbara

- Is concerned about the current proposal to build an 8 - lane raised motorway adjacent to the NSW Art Gallery, Domain and Botanic Gardens. She believes the current proposal is only a short term solution which will detrimentally affect areas such as the Domain, the NSW Art Gallery and the Botanic Gardens.

2731. GLASCOTT Joseph

- ED will create air pollution beside the Art Gallery and Royal Botanic Gardens, two of the most popular institutions in Sydney.
- ED will create visual pollution beside the Art Gallery and Royal Botanic Gardens.
- Alternatives to the raising and widening of the roadway should be considered to preserve the amenity of the sensitive environment around the Gallery and the Gardens.
- The RTA's plans involving the alienation of Moore Park lands and widening the roadway seem to be excessive.
- Proposed ED extension should be placed underground from the existing expressway tunnel near Macquarie Street through Woolloomooloo. The Domain could then be rejoined to the Botanic Gardens.

2732. GOODE R.J.

- The amenity of the historically and culturally significant areas around the gallery (Domain, Botanic Gardens, Parklands, Woolloomooloo) will be degraded.
- Concerned about safety issues of pedestrian overpasses. Children and the elderly may find them hard to use and may look for unsafe alternatives.
- Elevated roadway near Woolloomooloo would seriously compromise the visual amenity of this area.
- Make it a Masterplan that will be funded by seasonal increases relating to fuel. To cost effect this project the claiming back of some of the Federal Government and 3 x 3 State

residential streets which already have a high volume of traffic due to traffic avoiding arterial roads and the Primary School and racecourse. This leads to safety issues in a residential street. A right turn exit off Southern Cross Drive onto Dacey Avenue, possibly via a tunnel should be considered. A less preferable option is the closure of local streets if traffic flow is not improved along arterial roads.

2742. BELL Michael and Natalie

- Alternatives should be considered which will not pose a threat to the amenity of the Art Gallery.
- Lower the level of the existing Cahill Expressway so that the new road would be the same level as the present one. Then cover the proposed road.
- Alternatives should be considered which will not pose a threat to the sensitive environment of the Art Gallery.
- The toll booths should not be in close proximity to the Art Gallery. Will the toll booths cause a build up of traffic in the tunnel at peak times?

2743. SLOAN Kathleen

- The proposed raised motorway close to the Art Gallery , the Domain and Botanic Gardens would be a blot on the landscape.
- The proposed raised motorway close to the Art Gallery , the Domain and Botanic gardens would destroy the peace and calm of these areas.

2744. GREENWOOD B

- Concerned that this project will cut off direct access to the city, the Domain Park, the Botanical Gardens and Boy Charlton Pool
- Concerned that the project will produce more noise than is now present.
- Concerned that the project will cause traffic build up and that the idling cars in this traffic will cause excessive air pollution problems in the area.
- Raises concerns about the visual impact of an elevated roadway.

2745. AICKIN David

- Is opposed to the widening and raising of the roadway adjacent to the Art Gallery as it will restrict access to both the Art Gallery and the Botanic Gardens.

- Wants the section of the Distributor near the Art Gallery put underground so access to the Art Gallery and Domain can be maintained.

2746. TEMPLE Helen and Stephen BERRY

- Form type U
- The elevated roadway will affect the views from the Art Gallery.
- The proposed raised motorway close to the Art Gallery , the Domain and Botanic gardens would degrade the views to Woolloomooloo and the Harbour.
- The proposal would destroy the area around the Art Gallery, Domain and the Botanic Garden. Alternatives should be considered so that the amenity of the area is maintained.
- The proposed raised motorway close to the Art Gallery , the Domain and Botanic gardens would affect the enjoyment of visitors to the area.
- The proposed raised motorway may affect the noise levels of the Art Gallery cafe due to the location of the toll booth.
- The proposed raised motorway close to the Art Gallery , the Domain and Botanic gardens may be detrimental to the Art Gallery collection due to increased traffic, noise and pollution. This may affect the sensitive conditions required by the Gallery for its collection.

2747. TEMPLE R.B.

- The proposed raised eight lane motorway close to the Art Gallery would ruin the visual amenity of the Domain, Art Gallery, and views to Woolloomooloo and the Bay. This area is used by an increasing number of people.
- The road should be diverted underground in the Woolloomooloo area and the additional cost can be recouped by a small increase in the toll.
- The proposed raised eight lane motorway close to the Art Gallery should be placed underground so that the People's open space designated by Macquarie is partially restored and can be enjoyed by future generations.

2748. ROBERTS Carolyn

- Objects to noise during the construction period with the roadway being so close to their residence

- The road should be diverted underground in the Woolloomooloo area and the additional cost can be recouped by a small increase in the toll.
- Concerned about the dust impact from the construction close to residences.
- Concerned that the elevated roadway at Woolloomooloo will lead to continuous noise and noxious fumes due to high volume of traffic generated, especially at the tollgates.
- There will be a substantial drop in the value of "The Domain" unit due to the impact of the elevated roadway at Woolloomooloo.

2749. GENTRY Jennie and Simon

- Opposed to the building of the harbourside toll way. Do not add to the environmental disaster of the Cahill Expressway and have a Los Angeles type city.

2750. LEWIS Christine

- There has been no lessons learnt from the Cahill Expressway and the roads between the city and Darling Harbour.
- The road near the art gallery will be an eyesore and a reduction in the quality of living.
- Extra money should be spent on placing the toll road underground to avert the visual impact and reduction in quality of living that will be caused to the Domain, Botanic Gardens and the Art Gallery.

2751. ADAMS B and S

- Opposes the construction of the road toll near the harbourside as it will be an environmental disaster similar to the Cahill expressway.
- The proposed toll road should be placed underground behind the Art Gallery to lessen the environmental impact in the Woolloomooloo area.

2752. LANGTON (MP) Brian

- How will the Eastern Distributor cope with the additional traffic which will result from the proposal to extend the M5 to General Holmes Drive?
- The State Government should consider extending the cashbook scheme for the Motorway tolls to small business and owner drivers who are greatly disadvantaged by the present cash back scheme

64520