[redacted]

From: Sasa Stam [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:45 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sasa Stam

[redacted]

[redacted]y

[redacted]

From: Rebecca Finnane [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:44 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem. I just don't get why the focus keeps on being placed on building roads instead of making a world class public transport system. Put money into PUBLIC TRANSPORT that services the whole city and connects different areas more efficiently!

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long

way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the

endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable. The regeneration that Sydney Park has undergone is a great example of looking after our city and therefore the environment. To destroy any of it for the sake of a road is madness!

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Rebecca Finnane

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Wendy Thornton [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:43 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Wendy Thornton

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Phoebe Hamer [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:42 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Phoebe Hamer

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Lara Elle [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:39 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Lara Elle

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Shirley Hamilton [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:35 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Shirley Hamilton

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Anna Taylor [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:35 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Anna Taylor

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Trudi Anderson [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:24 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I cannot be more emphatic in my objection to this appalling project and ask you to stand up and reject the WestConnex proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS), not to mention that it is a terrible precedent, frightfully corrupt and overall a woeful legacy for the future. This is the legacy you will leave on Sydney. It needs to be visionary. This project is yesterdays answer to tomorrow's problems and it's not good enough.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The corruption that this project is riddled with is completely unacceptable in 2016. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long

way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the

endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Trudi Anderson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Ashar Salia [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:19 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Ashar Salia

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Erika Pidcock [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:18 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

This project belongs to the past century!!

We walk every day through Sydney Park, enjoying the sound of birds, meeting other dog owners and stopping for a chat. We feel surrounded by nature. All this is at stake with the planned WestConnex which will eventually destroy the calm green surroundings, add more traffic noise to the surrounding roads but also in the meantime cause enormous disruptions due to the construction work, that will go on for a long time.

Yours sincerely,

Erika Pidcock

[redacted]

From: suzanna szabo [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:18 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

suzanna szabo

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Susan Zunic[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:17 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Susan Zunic

[redacted] Wales 2576, Australia

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Andrew Kelly [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 6:19 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Kelly

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Michael Riches [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 6:14 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I don't believe there is any evidence anywhere to suggest more roads are a viable answer to congestion. Please consider funding on the terrible public transport where this sort of money spent will make a huge impact

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence

provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Riches

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Rowan Richards[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 6:06 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Rowan Richards

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Trish Corcoran [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 6:02 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Trish Corcoran

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Siobhan Hannan [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 6:00 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole appear corrupted and lacking transparency. Key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though the project is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The plans that are available have failed in particular to clarify how the St Peters interchange will manage the enormous influx of traffic into existing roads already burdened by massive traffic flows. Alexandria and surrounds already experience regular gridlock during peak traffic times and over the weekend and Westconnex promises to deliver more traffic into a highly congested mixed use area. What is the plan for managing this additional traffic in Alexandria, Newtown, Rosebery, and Green Square?

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social

and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is wasteful and inequitable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence

provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Siobhan Hannan

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Gehan Sawires [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:55 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Gehan Sawires

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Howard Byrnes [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:53 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Howard Byrnes

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Warisara Boyd [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 5:51 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Warisara Boyd

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Josephine Crimmins [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:55 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Josephine Crimmins

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Liz Hurley [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:53 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Liz Hurley

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: H Shields [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:51 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

H Shields

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Chantal Cordey [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:50 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Chantal Cordey

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Jonathan Prendergast [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:48 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts

have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jonathan Prendergast

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Margaret White [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:48 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret White

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Matthew Drake-Brockman [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 4:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Drake-Brockman

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Tim Shorten [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 4:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Shorten

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Alison Lyssa [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 4:22 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Alison Lyssa

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Peter Murphy [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 4:21 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of the information in this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that this kind of toll road mega-project is hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The M5 East and new M5 are always going to be congested because of the gross neglect of rail capacity on the Bankstown-Liverpool-Campbelltown line. I strongly support at least doubling the capacity of this line and enabling express peak-hour services.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on

the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from one area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Murphy

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Christopher Falzon [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 4:18 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

WestConnex will not lower vehicle greenhouse emissions, as the EIS suggests. AECOM has calculated the "vehicle kilometres travelled" (one vehicle travelling one kilometre, or the "VKT") in one year along different sections of the M4 East, including the tunnel, and the alternative route on Parramatta Rd. By 2031, on their figures, there will be 41 per cent more light vehicle traffic (cars, vans and motorbikes), from 266 million to 375 million VKT, if WestConnex is built compared with if it was not built. For heavy vehicles (trucks and buses) it is forecast to double annual VKT from 27 million to almost 57 million by 2031 with WestConnex compared with if it wasn't built. We're told that because traffic will be whizzing along rather than stuck in a jam, less fuel will be used. This argument has for years been discredited: what matters is the VKT. Higher VKT means higher greenhouse emissions. In any case, by 2031 WestConnex traffic will not be whizzing along. The official analysi

s shows that by 2031 there will be "high traffic densities" in the M4 East tunnel "particularly westbound during the AM peak where capacity is reached". Source: Gavin Gilchrist, 'WestConnex's climate claims dont ring true', SMH 29/10/15

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially

for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Falzon

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Martin MC Kibbin [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 4:18 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

I object to West Connex as above but also as a local resident. There is no logic to the fact that 60,000 extra vehicles per day are expected to use Euston Road. The road is gridlocked as it is and there is no room for such a high increases of cars on the road. This will mean that cars will take the local roads ie Lawrence /Huntley Street and Mitchell road as a rat run. This will drown Alexandruia traffic and the extra traffic will worsen air quality..My unit on 362 Mitchell road has an underground car park for residents to park. We already have considerable difficulty in peak hours both exiting and entering the basement car park.

Sydney Park , an award winning park will loose over 350 trees with the construction of WestConnex . This will result in an increase of greenhouse gases of 27%. The two smoke stacks in the park will be emitting unfiltered smoke, which is a health hazard. At the moment there is a Park Run every Saturday in the park where there are at least 300 runners. It is doubtful if the event will be able to continue as much of the current route will be acquired. Who would want to jog in the park breathing in such toxic fumes?

The construction of the West Connex will mean 24/7 rock hammering and earthworks and the surrounding streets and residences will be subject to extreme noise and sleep disturbances as a result.

West CONNEX COSTS keep skyrocketing. $17 billion is a huge waste of tax payers money for very little benefit.... The Auditor General needs to investigate as soon as possible.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Martin MC Kibbin

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 4:18 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I strongly object to the lack of due process evidenced by the awarding of contracts for the process, the compulsory acquisition of family homes and the planned destruction of local communities and greenspace before the affected local community had even been advised of the full facts. The fact that the State Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

This EIS considers benefits for all stages of the project but doesn't even begin to adequately address the negative impacts along the whole route or provide sufficient satisfactory mitigation measures to counter the unacceptable levels of disruption due to years of noise, heavy vehicle movements, tunnelling beneath homes and heritage buildings as well as the health risks due to exposure to increased levels of pollution.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

Furthermore, there are a number of additional health impacts that are not adequately addressed in the EIS.

The EIS refers to heavy vehicle movements and subterranean boring being permitted on a 24 hour basis. This would disrupt sleep patterns for many residents over a period of years. Poor sleep is associated with a number of health impacts including increased blood pressure, increased cholesterol levels, impaired work performance, increased anxiety and depression. It is not acceptable to allow high levels of noise around the clock when local by-laws do not allow increased noise levels after 10pm and before 6am. The same curfew that is applied to aircraft should be applied to any heavy vehicle movements and drilling activity.

Furthermore, the redistribution of traffic and focussed portal entry and exits would cause concentrations of noise and pollution. In addition ventilation fans and exhaust stacks would create new noise sources that would require monitoring. The EIS fails to adequately address these issues or provide appropriate mitigation measures. This information should be clearly spelled out and readily identified and appropriate mitigation planned.

I strongly object to the increased health risks that the population of the Inner West will be exposed to. It is unreasonable to expect that the vulnerable including children, the elderly and those with compromised immune systems should be exposed to increased levels of cancer causing pollutants and round-the-clock noise from heavy vehicles and machinery when mitigation strategies exist but have been excluded due to cost concerns.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modelling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modelling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunnelling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Cynthia Moore [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:53 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Cynthia Moore

[redacted]

This email was sent via do^gooder, a campaign platform that enables people to contact you regarding issues they care about. The FROM field of this email is campaigns@good.do however the email was sent by Cynthia Moore who provided this email address: CYNTHIAL.MOORE@GMAIL.COM

[redacted]

From: Sylvia Miles [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:49 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS). There has been a conspicuous lack of transparency from the start which suggests either, that the people behind the WestConnex project have absolutely no idea what they are doing, or that they have extremely strong ulterior motives for wanting it to succeed. If they had honourable reasons for promoting these works, would they not be pleased to share them with the public?

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the

poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Miles

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: James Free [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:46 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, Project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, Project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

James Free

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Loretta Pearman [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:44 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Loretta Pearman

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Trevor Watson [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:41 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Trevor Watson

[redacted]

This email was sent via do^gooder, a campaign platform that enables people to contact you regarding issues they care about. The FROM field of this email is campaigns@good.do however the email was sent by Trevor Watson who provided this email address: trevorwatson.services@gmail.com

[redacted]

From: Jo Shaw [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:40 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jo Shaw

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Harrison Godfrey [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:32 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Harrison Godfrey

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Ann Morey [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Ann Morey

Sydney NSW 2048, Australia

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Amand Levine [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:29 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Amand Levine

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Nicole Glavan [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Nicole Glavan

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:25 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Rubi Fernandes [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:25 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Rubi Fernandes

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Norbert Lambert [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:25 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Norbert Lambert

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:59 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:52 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

From: Geraldine Cahill [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:51 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Geraldine Cahill

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Dave Urquhart [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:47 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Dave Urquhart

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Howard Lovatt [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:47 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Howard Lovatt

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Belinda Dean [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:46 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Belinda Dean

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Catherine Keyzer [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:45 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Keyzer

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: stephanie oconnell [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:43 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

stephanie oconnell

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Diane Perdomo [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:43 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Diane Perdomo

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Michael Poole [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:39 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Poole

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Helen Campbell [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:39 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Helen Campbell

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: christine savage [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:39 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

christine savage

[redacted]

This email was sent via do^gooder, a campaign platform that enables people to contact you regarding issues they care about. The FROM field of this email is campaigns@good.do however the email was sent by christine savage who provided this email address: chrissy_savage@hotmail.com

[redacted]

From: Beth Taylor [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:38 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Beth Taylor

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Shiu W [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:35 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Shiu W

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: patrice grzelak [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:05 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

patrice grzelak

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: S Santos [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:05 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

S Santos

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Andrea Brooks [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Andrea Brooks

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Christopher Degeling [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:02 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Degeling

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Georgina Dingle [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:02 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Georgina Dingle

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Mark Sanfilippo [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 1:02 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Sanfilippo

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Sharon mitchell [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:59 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sharon mitchell

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Julie Short [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:58 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: SSI 14_6788: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I do not live in the St Peters area which will be affected by the abovenamed project. However I have kept myself aware of the issues as they are so similar to the problems and injustices that will impinge on the lives of people who reside in the area around Ashfield and Haberfiield if WestConnex is allowed to be developed in my area of Sydney.

I therefore do strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

This project will divert billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the

poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

It is quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale and Brighton-Le-Sands. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. Traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to very high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from one area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas would have on reducing traffic congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Julie Short

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:58 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Pearl Stuparich [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:57 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Pearl Stuparich

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Christina Hiotis [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:56 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Christina Hiotis

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Kelly Marr [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:55 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Kelly Marr

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Kerrie Lawson [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:55 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Kerrie Lawson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Sarah Emms [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:54 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Emms

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Dan Rossides [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:51 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Dan Rossides

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Martin Brady [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:49 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Martin Brady

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Mark Elliot-Ranken [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:48 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Elliot-Ranken

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 12:48 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Boris Pavic [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:16 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

The seven line of trafic will accomodate 61000 cars daily within two meters of my familly home. This is a masive increase from the current trafic levels of ~ 8000 cars daily on the four line road 12 metars from my family home. The EIS propsed mitigations are clearly unsufficient to adddress inducedd risks. I am severely concerned for the safety and health of my family. This is clearly unacceptable.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social

and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence

provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Iepiboca[redacted] Pavic

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: emily owen [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:12 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I have two small kids and I dont want them growing up with respiratory problems because the fumes from the westconnext st peters exchange will be wafting right over their home and school. My kids have asthma and we do not need more pollution to aggravate their conditions. I am concerned west connext will bring more rather than less traffic into the area and I am particularly worried about the noise and disruption this will bring to our lives. I am also concerned that we already have to contend with clearways and very restricted parking on our street and what will happen when unwins bridge rd becomes even more of a main road as seems to be indicated by the westconnext plan. I am also worried about the effect west connext will have on the thriving cultural life of newtwon st peters. Instead its going to make us a traffic jam

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence

provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

emily owen

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:10 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Sean Grech [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:06 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sean Grech

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Robert Fielden [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Fielden

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Jacqueline Sykes [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:02 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

At a WestConnex 'pop up Q&A' it was obvious there had been no consideration of the traffic chaos that will ensue in 2019. When I asked the 'traffic expert' what will happen in 2019 (should the project go ahead) when the extension to the tunnel brings new levels of traffic out onto the Princes Highway when Stage 3 will not be completed for another four years. He could only tell me that he thought mine was 'a good question'. Is that careful and considerate planning? I think not.

That same 'traffic expert' had no answer to my question about how the traffic will cope with having 6 lane, then 4 lanes then 2 lanes in Euston Road (as one example). I was told that would become RMS problem - with similar issues at the end of every widened road including Princes Highway into King Street and Campbell Street into Edgware Road. When faced with a problem, WestConnex just passes it onto RMS.

I was encouraged to leave questions at that Q&A session and was assured would be responded to. I'm not surprised but disappointed I have never received a reply.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. I met people already employed to dig the tunnels six months ago which tells me this casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jacqueline Sykes

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Jeni Mulvey [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 3:00 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jeni Mulvey

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Sally Okeby [redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, 27 January 2016 2:59 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic for thousands of residents and workers, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. The manner in which the social and economic impact study dismisses this is insulting to the affected communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

This project is diverting billions of dollars of NSW and Federal taxpayer money into a tollway that only 1% of people in NSW, most of whom are based in Sydney, will use. $16.8 billion invested across the state would go a very long way towards improving existing regional and city roads, public transport, schools and hospitals. Spending it on a tollway that so few people will use is both wasteful and deeply unfair.

If this project and other parts of WestConnex go ahead, the residents of western and south-west Sydney will be forced into even greater car dependency and paying large tolls to use this road. It is unacceptable that no attempt is made in this EIS to assess the impact alternatives such as increasing public transport capacity and connections within these areas combined with improved traffic management would have on reducing congestion and improving access to jobs for people in these suburbs.

It is also quite clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was done beyond a very narrowly defined area – as little as two intersections past the end of the project.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not accounted for in this EIS. This interchange has been positioned in what will be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that this EIS has factored in this huge increase in density.

The EIS does however clearly demonstrate that traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Brighton-Le-Sands and Kingsgrove. For example, according to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it, because the streets around it are already at capacity. As another example, traffic on Stoney Creek Road was forecast to increase by 74%, with a total of 2280 big truck movements a day — three times more than now.

Meanwhile, this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will take less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because the proponents know commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads. The assumptions behind the EIS's prediction that drivers will somehow decide to start paying this toll years after the toll road opens are not explained, and this has not been the experience with other recent toll road failures, including the aforementioned Cross City Tunnel.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS even though it has been awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. The EIS is riddled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling, and should be rejected on this basis alone.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities would be taking place. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week – including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage – is not justified. These activities would also cause vibration and damage to homes. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place less than 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads and unfiltered ventilation stacks. I am particularly concerned about residents on hills and in high buildings in Kingsgrove, St Peters, Arncliffe and Alexandria, who are likely to be subjected to high levels of these pollutants.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The analysis of alternatives to WestConnex provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters, where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the M5 East would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local

community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

This project will see roads expanded to within five metres of residents' homes, which is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria, it is within two metres of family homes. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I strongly object to compulsory acquisition of so many homes and businesses and the arrogant way the impact of this on communities is dismissed in the EIS. I also object to the process by which these acquisitions are taking place, which the NSW Government was told three years ago was deeply unfair to people whose properties were being forcibly acquired. It is clear from the number of home and business owners who have had their properties seriously undervalued by the RMS that such changes were not implemented, and in fact the government appears to have become systematically aggressive and unfair in its approach to forcibly taking properties for this project and other parts of the WestConnex. Valuable heritage buildings in St Peters will also be destroyed and/or left marooned and surrounded by tollway and congested roads.

There are no clear plans of where millions of cubic metres of spoil will be deposited in communities in western Sydney. None of these communities have been given information or consulted about these impacts. This is unacceptable.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sally Okeby

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Paul Baker [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:06 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Baker

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Griffen Edge [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:05 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Griffen Edge

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: John Dozan [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:03 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

John Dozan

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Peter Kuriakos [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:01 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Kuriakos

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Eva Vass [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:58 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Eva Vass

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Melissa Joy [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:53 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

M. Joy

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Maureen Freund [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:52 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

M. Freund

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Virginia Bridger [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:48 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Virginia Bridger

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:47 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Melissa Freund [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:45 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Melissa Freund

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:41 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Kaye Greenleaf [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:40 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I am writing to you as I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part. I ask that you reject this proposal outright on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive, and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. No independent transport expert backs the project.

WestConnex will:

-increase air pollution and traffic

- expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is very weak. It is completely inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). It also does not deliver any of the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

NO compelling case can be made for why WestConnex should be built. The project should not receive approval and it should definitely not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are very clear - benefits accruing from Stage 2 DO NOT outweigh the costs.

Benefits are shown to come about only when the whole WestConnex project is built - according to the Updated Strategic Business Case. No benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). Plus there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

WestConnex is a fundamentally flawed project. It does not account for changing work practices supported by technologies - teleworking, or flexible office spaces. Also car journeys are dropping as workers choose to work closer to home, or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also takes no account of how people may choose to travel in future. Developing technologies will also reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at a huge cost - blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. There is also a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion plus to be spent on WestConnex is money taken away from hospitals, schools and regional roads. Public transport improvements are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but in many parts of regional NSW.

If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary. My family and I urge that emerging public transport solutions from around the world, be urgently examined. Major cities are doing the opposite to WestConnex, and spending their transport budgets on public transport solutions.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I request that you to publish this submission, and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, and this despite the huge volume of documentation. This very lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. Project objectives are biased only towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven. It fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project. However, the EIS is not clear on exactly what transformation will be achieved. Does WestConnex deliver transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes?

To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that:

- increases traffic on local roads

- does not enable value capture or urban renewal

- is not consistent with the government's land use priorities

- is not consistent with the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

We know that traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East, and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode, would be a more effective long term solution than simply a 'predict and provide' approach. Yet this alternative - along with many others - has once again not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

Also the New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands, behaviours and technologies.

Another issue which is of prime importance for my family and our neighbours is that of heritage buildings that would be destroyed for this project. Other heritage buildings would be isolated in a flood of traffic, like terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents of South West Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation. This is particularly concerning when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I very strongly object to concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These barriers will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in a community.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street Newtown and St Peters, and to roads in Alexandria. I very strongly object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways. Clearways would be death-nell of the businesses on these roads, particularly in Newtown, and these thriving, historical communities would be decimated.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses. This has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners, many of whom are elderly and long-term, having lived all their lives in their community. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet the NSW Government has both failed to make the changes recommended, and has actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I very strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS. No information is provided

about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely and totally indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been allocated for this project before this EIS was even lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process. It places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to vastly increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. We know that there is no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, but the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I very strongly object to the way that this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS - it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. Public health must be of primary concern, and information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

Toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast, due to the flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures, for example Clem7 in Brisbane. It is completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest.

The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed before any further work is done on this project.

Tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Western Sydney or rural and regional NSW will not see any investment in their communities to create

employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West and South-West Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service, and are getting worse. This is because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths,

exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Kaye Greenleaf

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Steven Kovacevic [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:39 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Steven Kovacevic

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Laura Vander straaten [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 7:35 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Laura Vander straaten

[redacted]

[redacted]