Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: KEITH GOLDEN Address: 33 BUMBERRA ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: PETERSHAM Postcode 2049
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

◊ The EIS states that 'reasonable and feasible work practices and mitigation measures would be implemented to minimise potential noise impacts due to activities occurring at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site.' 96-52) This is not good enough. The EIS does not contain any detail whatsoever of these proposal on which they can comment. In addition, there is no requirement that measures will in fact be introduced to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain detail of specific noise mitigation measures that are mandated and can be enforced.

◊ Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years. The EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.

◊ The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.

◊ Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

◊ Heavy vehicle movements during peak hours – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'reasonable and practical management strategies would be investigated to minimize the volume of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours.' (8-53). This is also not acceptable as it is not known what will actually be done to manage this impact. It is not good enough for the EIS, which forms the basis of the approval of this project, to simply mention 'investigations' and not detail a proper plan (on which residents can comment) on management of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours. In addition, Darley Road is very congested from 7am until 9.30am and then from 4pm-6.30pm, well outside the 'peak' periods identified in the EIS. And the impact on traffic will be caused by 'light' vehicles and not simply heavy vehicles. It is clear that there is no plan for managing these vehicle movements. The EIS should not be approved as drafted. It is unacceptable for this volume of vehicles to be proposed for this critical arterial road with no plan for management

---

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: VICKI MOLLER Signature: V. Moller *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 41 CROWN STREET Suburb: ST PETERS NSW Postcode 2044	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

a. *Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates and unacceptable risk of damage to homes due to settlement (ground movement). The EIS acknowledges that at tunnelling at 35 metres and less this is a real risk. There is no mitigation provided for this risk. Instead, it states that properties will be repaired at the Government's expense. However no details or assurance as to how this will occur are provided. The project should not be approved with such tunnelling depths permitted and with no detail as to the extent of damage and how and when it will be repaired. It will lead to the situation where residents and businesses are forced to engage structural engineers and lawyers to prove that the damage was linked to Westconnex works, with no assurance that this property damage will be promptly and satisfactorily fixed.*

b. *EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. "The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in Chapter 1, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.*

c. *The business case for the project in all three stages has failed to taken into account the external costs of these massive road projects in air pollution for human and environmental health, in adding fossil fuel emissions to increase global warming effects, and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities, of displacement of people and businesses and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh any benefits from building roads which poorly serve people's transport needs but instead enrich private corporations.*

d. *The traffic around St Peters expected to be heavier because of the increased road access to the new Interchange will adversely affect our community because moving around to our parks and to the shops, to the buses and to the train stations, for pedestrians and cars, will be more difficult. Our community is being sacrificed for the marginal improvement in traffic movement elsewhere in Sydney. No measures to ameliorate the impact are mentioned. This is unacceptable.*

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Alan Bell
	Address: 9/50 FOTHERINGHAM ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: ENMORE Postcode 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

a. **The latest EIS was released just ten business days after feedback period ended for the Concept Design for the M4/M5 and before preliminary drilling to establish a route through the Inner West is completed. WHAT IS THE RUSH? This EIS is little more than a concept design and is far less developed than earlier ones. It is composed of many indicate only plans such that it is impossible to know what the impacts will be and yet approval is being sought in a rush. The EIS ignores more than 1500 submissions, including one of 142 pages from the Inner West Council.**

b. **One toll road leads to another 3 being proposed. The EIS's for the M4 East and the New M5 argued the case that serious congestion created near interchanges would be solved once the M4/M5 was built. Now it seems this is not the case and more roads will be needed to relieve the congestion – WHERE DOES THIS END? According to the M4/M5 EIS the real benefits will depend on building the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Airport Link and a tollway heading South. None of these projects have been planned, let alone approved but yet are part of addressing the congestion impacts acknowledged for the M4/M5link project. Given this how is it possible to know or address the impacts of the M4/M5 Link, unless this is just yet more justification for yet more roads?**

c. **Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.**

d. **Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.**

e. **The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.**

f. **For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.**

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001*	Name: Rebecca Charles Address: 7a Conway Avenue
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Postcode Cambridge Park
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

A. I object to the whole WestConnex project but particularly this stage because the original objectives of the project – improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany – are now pushed off to another unplanned, unfunded project. The community is asked to support this proposal on the basis of several more projects, in the case of the Sydney gateway, without even a sketch of a plan.
B. Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more cars per day on the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity. I object to this push for the M4-M5 link when there are still no plans for the Sydney Gateway to deal with the increased traffic.
C. I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as being needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for more than 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.
D. We know the state government intends to sell the project, both the construction and the operation of the new roads. I object to the privatization of the road system. There is no guarantee of protecting the public interest in an efficient transport system when so much of it operates to make a profit for shareholders.
E. I object particularly to the tollway going east which are unfair when people living west of Parramatta really need alternative means of travelling north-south to local neighbourhoods. If we had better public transport, eg, better train services and more buses which connect our suburbs, then many of us would not have to drive and this would reduce the traffic congestion.
F. Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.
G. Public transport is basically rejected by the EIS so the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. We know this is to promote private road operators' profits. I object to putting so much public funding to the cause of private profit.
H. I also object to the WestConnex project because of the increased vehicle pollution it will cause. The UK and European states are more and more concerned about the bad effects of car emissions on people's health and are taking steps to tougher emission standards. Here the state government is promoting car use at the expense of public health concerns.

I ask the Secretary of Planning to refuse approval for this project.

Campaign Mailing Lists :I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Mathew Wilson

Signature: M Wilson

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 8 Victoria Ave Campsie

Suburb: Campsie Postcode 2194

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Recently Andrew Constance has been quoted numerous times promoting his vision of the transport future and some of these views are aired in the EIS but the vision put forward is highly visionary with no practical detail addressing how these changes are going to be brought about and so they are totally unrealistic. For example it is starting to be commonly accepted that car manufacturers will be reducing production of petrol/diesel cars before 2040 probably starting in 2030. It is proposed that electric cars will then take over. It is suggested that cars will be charged over night at people's homes. Virtually no one in the Inner City Suburbs has a garage. Are all the streets throughout all the suburbs going to be fitted out with charging points outside all the houses, similar to parking meters? We have all watched the shambles of the rolling out of the NBN it would be mind blowing to watch what would happen with the rolling out of charging points to each household without a garage and it would take years to achieve. There are virtually no recharging points at any Fuel Stations anywhere as yet and to set these up will take years. A large part of the population run older cars, because that is all they are able to afford. It will take many years for these petrol/diesel cars to disappear. Andrew Constance has also said that when everyone is driving an autonomous car average speeds will be reduced but as they are not being controlled by individual drivers this will mean they will be able to travel much closer together and so there will not be so much delay caused by spread out congestion. If this is to be so perhaps the suggestion could be made that some mechanism could be employed which would enable these cars to link together; if that could be done then they could form -a TRAIN - and then really travel at speed!

- The decision to build a three-stage tollway instead of expanding public transport has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.

- We object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that it provides for daily movements of 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road. This creates an unacceptable risk to the safety of pedestrians accessing the North Leichhardt light rail stop as well as bicycle users accessing the bicycle route on Darley Road and entering Canal road to join the dedicated bike paths on the bay run. Many school children cross at this point to walk to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College. The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link with no trucks to access Darley Road. The selection of Darley Road should not be approved if it involves any truck movements on Darley Road, which is what it currently provides.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ **Email** _____ **Mobile** _____

Attention Director *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001*	Name: J MASON
	Address: 17 Centre Cres
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Postcode Blaxland 2774
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- I object to the whole project because it will force people into cars instead of expanding public transport. Out west the majority of commuters to the city use the trains and don't drive. It would be far better to spend the money on improving the train service, not building a huge expensive tollway.

- I object because the people of Western Sydney were never consulted about where they wanted new roads or what transport they prefer. The WestConnex project with the high tolls increasing every year was just dumped on Western Sydney residents.

- For a small part of the money for this project the railway signal system and the rails could have been modernised and upgraded. Western Sydney could have more frequent and faster services which would really benefit the communities west of Parramatta. What Western Sydney commuters really need is an extension of the heavy rail train system. I object to the fact that this choice was never presented to us.

- I object to 43 years of the tolls. This has been imposed on drivers as income for a private motorway owner-operator. The fact that the toll is based on distance travelled disadvantages people who live on the western side of the Sydney region.

- The tolls will be a heavier burden in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, Blacktown or Wetherill Park where households on average have lower household incomes compared to the inner suburbs. It is quite unfair when the all benefits of Stage 3 are for north-south connections to the northern beaches or the proposed new harbour tunnel.

- The point of the original WestConnex project was a direct route to the airport and Port Botany This is not even part of WestConnex. But the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity. I object to the push for the M4-M5 link when there are still no plans for the Sydney Gateway to deal with the increased traffic.

The Secretary of Planning should refuse approval for this project.

Campaign Mailing Lists :I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001*	Name: Heidi Howell
	Address: 54 Hilliger Rd S
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Postcode Sth Penrith 2750
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Heidi C Howell
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. I object to the way this project is hailed by the Minister for Western Sydney, Stuart Ayres, as for the benefit of western Sydney when hardly any parts of Sydney west of Parramatta are even mentioned in the EIS. All the reasons for this stage of WestConnex are about linking the new M4 and M5 to the western harbour tunnel and northern beaches tunnel. Or they talk about links to the "Sydney Gateway" to the airport and Port Botany and they are not even part of this project.
2. The original objectives of the WestConnex project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. We now have the proposals for all three stages and the Sydney Gateway to the airport and port Botany are not included in any of them. The community is asked to support this proposal on the basis of more unfunded projects, based on "artistic" impressions.
3. The EIS accepts that drivers from lower income households are more likely to travel longer distances to avoid tolls because of the cost. So you either pay the high tolls (capped at $7.95 in 2015 dollars) or you drive for longer to avoid the tolls. We have seen this already where commuters have decided to drive on Parramatta Rd without tolls, not the new M4 with the new tolls.
4. Because of the high tolls drivers who have to travel east daily will look for alternative routes and build up the traffic on local roads, both here in western Sydney, on Parramatta Rd and all the way to the city. There is no way the WestConnex roads will reduce traffic on un-tolled roads with tolls on the WestConnex sections so high.
5. I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community for independent assessment. We are just told to accept all the assertions that the tollways will relieve traffic on other roads, particularly Parramatta Rd.
6. The EIS admits that the five plus years of construction of the M4-M5 Link will worsen traffic on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it is outrageous for motorists to be asked already to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.
7. The UK and European states are more and more concerned about the bad effects of car emissions on people's health and are taking steps to tougher emission standards. Here the state government is promoting car use at the expense of public health concerns. I object to the WestConnex project because of the increased car emissions it will cause.
8. Public transport is rejected by the EIS so the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. We know this is to promote private road operators' profits. I object to putting so much public funding to the cause of private profit. I ask that this project be refused approval by the Secretary of Planning.

Campaign Mailing Lists :I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: ALAN HIND

Signature: [signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
***Declaration** : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 8 ALICE AVE

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2042

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- **Many students walk or ride to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College schools via Darley Road.There are also a number of childcare centres very close to the Darley Road site.**

- **There will be 100 workers a day on the site, with provision for only 10-20 car spaces and there is a concession that local streets will be used, who will be 'encouraged' to use public transport. Our experience with the major construction sites in Haberfield, and St Peters that public transport is not used by the workers and that despite the fact they are not supposed to do so, they park in our local streets and cause strife with our residents.**

- **I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.**

- **The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other.**

- **It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With four unfiltered emissions stacks in the area plus a large number of exit portals, the residents of this area will suffer greatly from poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that , the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic." As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."**

- **The EIS states that traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange is expected to be worse after completion of the M5 and the M4-M5 Link particularly in the evening peak hour. The EIS admits that this will have a "moderate negative" impact on the neighbourhood in increasing pollution (also admitted separately) therefore in health impacts, on safety for foot and cycle traffic but also for vehicles and on the local amenity.**

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: GEORGE APOSTOLOS

Signature: [signature]

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 10 WELLS ST.

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2042

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on resident, including noise, loss of business, dust, and lost time through more traffic congestion, are identified in the EIS, the approach is always to recommend approval and promise vague 'mitigation' in the future. This is not good enough.

- The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

- Impacts not provided – Permanent water treatment plant and substation – The EIS states that there will be an office, worker parking and buildings to accommodate this facility on a permanent basis. It does not provide any detail as to – noise impacts, numbers of workers on site, any health risks associated with the facility. This is simply inadequate and the decision to locate this facility should be subject to a thorough assessment and approval process. It should not be approved as part of this EIS as there is simply no detail provided about the impact of this facility on the amenity of the area.

- The site should be returned to the community as compensation for the imposition of this construction site in our neighbourhood for a 5 year period. If the substation and water treatment plant is moved to the north of the site, then the lower half of the site (which is the most accessible end) could be converted into open space with mature trees planted. As this site is immediately adjacent to the bay run, bicycle parking and other facilities that support active transport could be included. This would result increase the green space for residents and result in a pleasant green environment for pedestrians, rather than a fenced facility.

- The City West Link Eastbound AM and PM peak hour and other locations."Table 7-19 shows that several locations are forecast to exceed theoretical roadway capacity with the increased background traffic and the construction traffic in the 2021 AM and PM peak hours. However, traffic on the majority of these roads would exceed their theoretical capacity even without the construction traffic, simply due to the growth in background traffic". So in the full knowledge that this area will be at capacity in 2021, massive amounts of construction traffic are going to be added for the whole construction period of 5 years. Even on completion it is stated in the EIS that traffic will be worse in this area than 'without the project'. This categorically shows that the planning of Westconnex is totally inadequate and needs major changes. It also shows that when completed Westconnex will not work. It is abundantly obvious that Rail/Metro is the only option to radically overhaul Sydney's failed transport systems

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: WALTER NAVEBA

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 9 HART ST

Suburb: TEMPE Postcode 2044

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- 2 G Appendix P Table 5-27 of the EIS states that 43% of the Leichhardt- Glebe Precinct travel to work by Car, 21% by Bus and 5%by Rail. These are figures for 2011. These figures are being used to promote the project and suggest they are accurate today. In the case of Rail these figures are extremely questionable. The Light Rail is now hugely popular, it's use having grown enormously. It is travelling at full capacity at Peak hours. More services are being put in place. Apartment blocks are being built as close to the Light Rail corridor as possible. Residents see the Light Rail as an efficient, reliable and timely method of commuting to work. It is blatantly obvious that the Govt should be investing heavily in building and extending Light Rail, Metro and Rail. If this were pursued in a professional manner the necessity for trying to hoodwink the community into believing that Westconnex were needed would be totally unnecessary.

- The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

- Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for workers(EiS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.

- There will be increases of noise in the area of Johnston St where traffic volumes will increase. Residents will be more susceptible to health impacts associated with increased noise. In the EIS it is stated that residents may have to keep their windows closed. They may well experience sleep disturbance and interference of living activities like eating outdoors. However the EIS considers this to be only moderately negative. This is not acceptable.

- I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.

- For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

- Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: John Thomasson
	Address: Augustus St.
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Enmore Postcode 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: John P Thomasson
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration:** I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

a) The management of water in the Rozelle Yards is of great concern as the site is highly contaminated and the construction work that will be carried out will cause a great deal of disturbance especially once vegetation has been removed. There will be potential impacts from contaminated soils, leakage/spills of hydrocarbons and other chemicals from machinery, vehicles transporting spoil adjacent to roads and stormwaters, rinse water from plant washing and concrete slurries. Water from tunnelling activity and other works will also introduce contaminants. The EIS says that much of this water will be treated in temporary treatment facilities and sediment tanks before being released to Whites Creek and Rozelle Bay. The EIS does not disclose what levels of pollution controls will be implemented to make sure that contaminated water is not released into White's Creek or Rozelle Bay. This is not acceptable.

b) In 2033 with the M4 - M5 link the WRTM is forecasting reductions in peak travel times between the M4 corridor and the Sydney Airport/Port Botany area. The times savings that are quoted miniscule! Between Parramatta and Sydney Airport the time saving is 10 minutes. Between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saving is 5 minutes. Between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saving is 10 minutes. So for well over $20Billion all that can be saved is just a handful of minutes! This total waste of public money is completely unacceptable.

c) I object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site because of the unacceptable risk it will create to the safety of our community. Darley Road is a known accident and traffic blackspot and the movements of hundreds of trucks a day will create an unacceptable risk of accidents. On Transport for NSW's own figures, the intersection at the City West Link and James Street is the third most dangerous in the inner west.

d) EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. "*The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in* ***Chapter 1****, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval*". The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: SM Badgery

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 17 Sunshine St

Suburb: Culburra Beach Postcode:

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The EIS needs to provide specific detail as to what will be provided by way of alternative accommodation to the 36 residents identified as suffering extreme noise interference. There is no plan to temporarily relocate such residents, not to offer them financial compensation to enable them to move out during the worst period. There is an estimated 10 weeks of extreme noise during demolition of the commercial building and preparatory road works. Once this work is finished the residents will also be forced to endure a truck every 304 minutes for a period of five years. It is clearly not possible for such residents to continue to live in these houses and the EIS needs to detail what will be provided in terms of alternative living arrangements for part, or all of the construction work period.

- For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

- Hundreds of risks associated with this project have not been assessed but have instead been deferred to a detailed design stage into which the public will have no input. I call on the Department of Planning to reject this inadequate EIS that has been prepared by AECOM that has multiple commercial interests in WestConnex.

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

- Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years. The EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: SM Badgery
	Address: 17 Sunshine St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Culburra Beach Postcode
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
***Declaration:** I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

⇒ The key intersection performance tables in App H (p.258 St Peters and 248 Rozelle) demonstrate that many intersections will either worsen (at the worst case scenario of LOS F) or remain unchanged particularly in 2033, including the following intersections:

- Princes Highway/Canal Road
- Princes Highway/Railway Road
- Unwins Bridge Road/Campbell Street
- Campbell Road/Bourke Road
- Princes Highway/Campbell Street
- Ricketty Street/Kent Road
- Gardeners Road/Kent Road
- Gardeners Road/Bourke Road
- Gardeners Rd/O'Riordan Street
- Victoria Road/Lyons Road
- Victoria Road/Darling Street
- Victoria Road/Robert Street

⇒ I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.

⇒ The proponent excludes the impact of the Western Sydney Airport from analysis of the project. This could have a significant impact on traffic volumes.

⇒ The modelling shows significant increases in traffic on Victoria Rd (+20% ADT) which is already at capacity.

⇒ Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

⇒ Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

⇒ The modelling shows the motorway exceeds reasonable operating limits in the peak in less than ten years.

⇒ The underlying traffic modelling and outputs was insufficient to:

- Demonstrate the need for the project.
- Understand impacts of dispersed traffic on connecting roads, such as the Anzac Bridge, and whether they have available capacity to meet the predicted traffic discharge. Any congestion on exits has the capacity to negate all travel time savings to the exit point, given the small predicted benefits.

Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment. GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW,2001

Attention Director — Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: SM Bridgeman

Signature: [signature]

Please include/delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
Declaration: I have not made any reportable donations in the last two years.

Address: 17 Sunshine St

Suburb: Culburra Beach Postcode:

I wish to register my strong objections to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link). My reasons are set out below:

REASONS FOR WESTCONNEX

1.The main reason given for the construction of the WestConnex motorway is to connect to Sydney Airport and Port Botany. The project has failed to meet both of these objectives.

TRAVEL TIME SAVED?

2. If stage 3 of the Westconnex project is completed, it is predicted that by 2033, reductions in peak travel times from Western Sydney to the airport area and to the Botany Port area will be **miniscule**. Parramatta to Sydney airport area will save **10 minutes**, between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saved will **be 5 minutes** and between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saved will **be 10 minutes.** These are only the best predictions put forward and time savings may in fact be much less. The whole rationale for building this wasteful **18 billion dollar** polluting project was precisely for that reason… to reduce travel times and to connect with Port Botany and the Airport.

SUBSIDENCE AND HOUSE DAMAGE

3.The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of **ground movement and subsidence is lessened** where tunnelling is more than **35 metres underground**. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg **John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 2 7 metres.(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1)**. At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

HEALTH DANGERS

4. It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With massive number of extra truck **four unfiltered emissions stacks** in the area plus a **large number of exit portals,** the residents of this area will suffer greatly from **poisonous diesel particulates.** This is negligent when you consider that, the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared **diesel particulates carcinogenic**. " As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."

CAR PARKING CONGESTION

5.Rozelle Rail Yards will have **400 car** parking spaces provided for workers(EIS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately **550.** This means **that 150 vehicles** will need to **park in nearby local streets** which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.

AIR AND NOISE POLLUTION

6. Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience **increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution**— most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe and in Victoria street and its surrounds in Rozelle. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a **massive number of extra truck movements** and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times. Also, the widening of the Crescent between the city West Link and Johnston street with **an extra lane being constructed** will lead to heavy traffic congestion on a road that has **3 Primary/Infants schools**. In Rozelle work will take place as close as 250 metres from the Rozelle Primary School when construction of the Iron

Cove Link tunnel entrances and exits on Victoria Road take place. In fact, Anzac Bridge is **currently at maximum** capacity during peak hours.

Furthermore, the EIS states that the current Rozelle Interchange and surrounds of Anzac Bridge are presently close to full capacity. Modelling shows that the project will have significant impact on the area surrounding Rozelle Interchange. The Anzac Bridge will have 60% more traffic in 2033 and will be at full capacity in off peak times by2021.The interchanges at Victoria Rd and Darling St and Victoria Rd and Robert St will have become intolerable which means bus reliability and performance will be worsened.

With the proposed construction, the area is going to be subjected to a huge increase in vehicle movements throughout the 5 year construction period.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS

7.The removal of spoil from the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to **the largest number of spoil truck movements** on the entire Stage 3 project: **517 Heavy truck movements a day,** of which 46 are stated to take place during peak hours. This will lead to extra noise and air pollution in this area.

The **unacceptable noise levels** which will accompany the construction of this massive interchange will further add to the discomfort of the residents. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution which will adversely affect residents. The EIS actually states that local residents may have to keep their windows and doors closed to keep out the noise and dust. The proposed work hours for construction in the Goods Yard for the tunneling and spoil removal are 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This could lead to loss of sleep for local residents as well as loss of lifestyle.

There will also be disturbance of soil in the old Rozelle Goods Yard which may be thick with toxic contaminants such as **lead and asbestos**(as was the case in St Peters.) You made no provision for the safe removal of these toxic substances in St Peters and I do not see any provision in the EIS for their safe removal in this area.

LOSS OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

8. The removal of Buruwan Park between The Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Parade, Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a direct loss of much-needed parkland in this inner city area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a **major cycle route** from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, IJTS and the CBD.

PROPOSED PARK

9.The proposed building of a park in the area of the Goods Yard right in the middle of a large number of exit portals and **poisonous smoke stacks** borders on being criminally negligent. This new **''recreational area' will** be subject to the dangerous invisible particulates of 2.5 microns and smaller so many residents and children will be unaware that they are being poisoned. **All evidence shows that these particulates are linked with increased cases of asthma, lung disease, cancer and stroke** placing further pressure on our already overloaded health system.

RESIDENT CONSULTATION

10. Although the EIS indicates what is to be expected when construction begins, it also states that that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed upon. This may result in major **changes to the project design and construction methodologies**. The community would have **no say in this process**!

CHANGE OF PLANS?

11. In the introduction of the EIS it clearly states that the information in the EIS is 'indicative of the final design' only. The reality of this statement means that the project may be completely different to stated plans in the EIS.

OTHER IMPACTS TO CONSIDER

13. The Sydney Metro West project which is Sydney's next big railway infrastructure investment is not included in the Cumulative Impact Assessment! A **business case for the Metro** should be completed **before a decision** is taken on the Stage 3 project as it may be significantly impacted by the Metro.

The Inner City Regional Bike Network has also **not been included** in the projects assessed under 'Cumulative Impacts'. It is identified by Infrastructure Australia as a 'Priority Initiative' and therefore must be included.

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: S M Bondjem

Signature: S M Bondjem

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 17 Sunshine St

Suburb: Auburn Beach Postcode:

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

~~and~~ the 7500 page EIS edited, printed, checked and distributed in 12 days. The EIS was obviously prepared prior to the closing of submission to the Concept Design. This is a total abuse of the NSW Planning Laws.

- The EIS narrowly defines congestion as 'traffic congestion' rather than delays to reliable and efficient access to human capital, goods and services which reduces economic activity and productivity. This results in an incorrect and misleading assessment.

- The introduction of the EIS clearly states that the information in the EIS is " indicative" of the final design only. The reality of this statement means that the project may be completely different to stated plans in the EIS. Furthermore although the EIS indicates what is to be expected when construction begins, it also states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed upon. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community would have no say in this process.

- The Parramatta Road Urban Transformation project has been put on hold by the NSW Government for a number of reasons, including the uncertainties relating to traffic capacity on Parramatta Road following the construction of WestConnex. To claim this as a benefit is misleading. The project predicts increased traffic congestion on Parramatta Road without the transformation, which clearly is not a benefit, and potentially funnels traffic unable to penetrate the corridor into the privately operated toll road.

- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur. It states that subsidence may occur along tunnel paths due to tunnel excavation and water drawdown. The risk of ground movement and subsidence is greater where tunnels are less than 35 metres underground. The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels in that area which are a great deal less than 35metres. The same is true for areas of Rozelle where layers of tunnels are proposed. This will definitely lead to structural damage and cracking to homes above. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage. This is not acceptable

- The EIS is a strategy document only. It does not commit to any design, and therefore it doesn't address any local issues which are created by the construction of the M4-M5 link. Its whole purpose is to prepare a legal and bureaucratic pathway for the sale of Sydney Motor Corporation to the private sector thereby removing the Government from the oversight and ~~scrutiny~~ scrutiny of the Project. This is unacceptable

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: S M Bridgen

Signature: S Bridgen

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 17 Sunshine St

Suburb: Culburra Beach Postcode:

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.

- Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution– most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times

- The EIS does not mention the impact of aircraft noise and its cumulative impact. As such, the noise levels identified are misleading. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site because of the unacceptable noise impacts it will have on surrounding homes and businesses.

- This EIS provides no basis on which to approve such a complex project including the building of interchanges underneath Sydney suburbs Rozelle and Leichhardt. It would be absurd to approve the building of up to three tunnels under people's homes on the basis of such flimsy information

- The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link – in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area – in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other. The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area.

- The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: S M Bridgen
	Address: 17 Sunshine St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Culburra Beach Postcode
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: S Bridgen

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

Declaration *I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years*

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The level of streets leading to and around the Inner West Interchange are astonishingly low, eg John St at 22m, Emma St at 24m, Hill St at 28m, Moore St 27m, Piper St 37m, (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2), Catherine St at 28m (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1) - homes would indisputably sustain damage or cracking at these depths.

- Given that the modelling for air quality is based on the traffic modelling, which, as shown ~~above~~, is fundamentally flawed, and given poor air quality has a significant health impact the EIS should not be approved until an independent scientifically qualified reviewer has analysed the stated air quality outcomes and identified any deficits

- Concentrations of some pollutants $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} are already near the current standard and in excess of proposed standards (p9-81, p9-93). It is critical to note that these particulates are a classified carcinogen and are known to have critical, and at times fatal, consequences if elevated. People living within 500 metres of heavily affected areas have demonstrably shorter lives, much higher incidences of chronic lung conditions and higher levels of cardiovascular diseases.

- I object to the whole WestConnex project and Stage 3, the M4-M5 Link in particular, because I object to paying high tolls to fund a road project that does not benefit Western Sydney.

- The EIS notes that an 'Operational Traffic Performance Review' will be undertaken at 12 months and five years after the M4-M5 Link is open to consider the need for "post-opening mitigation measures" (Page 223, Chapter 9.8, Appendix H). I object to this approach as it is contrary to the requirements of the EIS process and reflects a clear admission on the part of the NSW Government that:
- It has no confidence in the traffic modelling process to predict to any reliable extent the likely impacts of the Project;
- It is unable or unprepared to describe the true impacts of the Project on the people of NSW;
- It has not considered or budgeted for the potentially significant additional roadworks required to address the impacts of the Project (or the need for road upgrades to feed toll-paying drivers to WestConnex.

- The modelling conclusions are internally inconsistent. There is an assumption that traffic would dissipate at the edge of the motorway with no negative impacts on the CBD, Mascot and Alexandria. However there is also an assumption that additional roads would be needed to cope with said traffic.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: SM Bridgeman

Signature: [signature]

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 17 Sunshine St

Suburb: Culburra Beach Postcode

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- SMC should not permit any truck movements near the Darley Road site. The alternative proposal which provides that all spoil trucks enter and leave from the City West link is the only proposal that should be considered.

- (6-51) The EIS needs to mandate that these measures are in place. Where mentioned, the acoustic shed that is considered offers the lower grade noise protection. This is despite the fact that 36 'sensitive receivers' are identified in the EIS, who will have extreme noise disturbance through much of the 5-year construction period. In addition, the acoustic shed covers only the spoil and spoil handling area and not the tunnel entrances and exits. The highest level of noise protection, which is only suggested in the EIS, needs to be mandated in the EIS. In addition, the shed needs to cover both the entrance and exit to the site and not simply the spoil handling areas. The independent engineer's report (commissioned by the Inner West council) states that it is likely, because of the elevated position of the site, that it is likely an acoustic shed will not contain the noise to an acceptable level. In addition, a temporary access tunnel will be built from the top of the site and run directly under homes in James Street. These homes will be unacceptably impacted by the construction noise and truck movements without these additional measures
- It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?

- The widening of the Crescent between the City West link and Johnston St with an extra lane being constructed will lead to heavy traffic congestion. This will be exacerbated still further by extra traffic light control cycles being incorporated into the signaling at both Johnston St and at the City West Link, with the inclusion of an extra traffic light control 400m West from the Crescent / City West Link junction to manage the movement of large numbers of spoil trucks.

- The EIS at 7-21 states that Community update Newsletters were distributed to residents 'near the project footprint' in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses 'letterboxed'. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.
- The EIS at 12-57 describes possible disruptions of water supply to a vast area of Sydney as a result of tunnelling ~~is the~~ This is unacceptable!

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: SM Dongery
	Address: 17 Sunshine St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Culburra Beach Postcode
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.*
***Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years*

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

1. The key intersection performance tables in App H (p.258 St Peters and 248 Rozelle) demonstrate that many intersections will either worsen (at the worst case scenario of LOS F) or remain unchanged particularly in 2033, including the following intersections:
   - Princes Highway/Canal Road
   - Princes Highway/Railway Road
   - Unwins Bridge Road/Campbell Street
   - Campbell Road/Bourke Road
   - Princes Highway/Campbell Street
   - Ricketty Street/Kent Road
   - Gardeners Road/Kent Road
   - Gardeners Road/Bourke Road
   - Gardeners Rd/O'Riordan Street
   - Victoria Road/Lyons Road
   - Victoria Road/Darling Street
   - Victoria Road/Robert Street

2. I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.

3. The proponent excludes the impact of the Western Sydney Airport from analysis of the project. This could have a significant impact on traffic volumes.

4. The modelling shows significant increases in traffic on Victoria Rd (+20% ADT) which is already at capacity.

5. Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

6. Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

7. The modelling shows the motorway exceeds reasonable operating limits in the peak in less than ten years.

8. The underlying traffic modelling and outputs was insufficient to:
   - Demonstrate the need for the project.
   - Understand impacts of dispersed traffic on connecting roads, such as the Anzac Bridge, and whether they have available capacity to meet the predicted traffic discharge. Any congestion on exits has the capacity to negate all travel time savings to the exit point, given the small predicted benefits.

9. Public transport is rejected by the EIS so the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. We know this is to promote private road operators' profits. I object to putting so much public funding to the cause of private profit. I urge the Secretary of Planning to reject this project.

I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: S M Bridgeman

Signature: S M Bridgeman

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 17 Sunshine St

Suburb: Culburra Beach Postcode

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

◊ The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)

◊ The EIS states that the Rozelle interchange and the surrounds of the Anzac Bridge are currently close to capacity. With the proposed project construction the area is going to be subjected to a huge increase in vehicle movements throughout the area for 5 years. Even the 'with project' scenario states that this area will experience no improvement and if anything the current situation will be worse. This is totally unacceptable and proves that the whole project is a complete White Elephant. Indeed it is stated in the EIS that the only way to mitigate for this situation by 2033 is for the working population to adjust their work hours. "Due to forecast congestion, some of this traffic is predicted not to be able to start or finish their journey within the peak period. Some drivers will therefore choose to make their journey either earlier or later in the peak period to avoid delay. This behavior is called 'peak spreading'..." This is a categorical admission of failure of this complete project and a stupendous waste of Tax Payers money.

◊ The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

◊ The mechanical ventilation proposed depends on single direction tunnel construction, so how it can possibly work for large curved tunnels on multiple levels is unknown.

◊ Worker parking – Leichhardt. There is provision in the EIS for only a dozen worker car parks and no provision for the 100 or so workers who will be permanently based at the Darley Road site for up to five years. A major construction site project should not be permitted in a neighbourhood area without allocated parking for all workers. No other business would be permitted to be established without this requirement being satisfied – why is it acceptable for this project? In addition, the EIS proposes the removal of 20 car spaces used by residents on Darley Road and will remove the 'kiss and ride' facility at the light rail stop. This will result in residents being unable to park in their own street and will increase noise impacts from workers doing shift changeovers 24 hours a day.

Attention Director *Application Number: SSI 7485* *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001* *Application Name:* *WestConnex M4-M5 Link*	*Name:* SM Bridgen *Signature:* [signature] *Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 17 Sunshine St *Suburb:* Culburra Beach *Postcode*

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

- The nature of proposed "post-opening mitigation measures" (Page 223, Chapter 9.8, Appendix H) are unknown and their impacts could be significant including intersection and road widening (and associated property loss), banning parking in local centres, removal of trees, footpaths and cycling facilities. The people of NSW have a reasonable expectation to understand whether such impacts form part of the Project and they should be detailed in the EIS. They should not be left to a "wait and see" approach. Not only a proper analysis of demand, but also of traffic dispersion should be provided for connecting roads up to three kilometres from every exit and entry portal and the capacity of those roads analysed.

- Road congestion is reducing bus performance and reliability. The project will make it worse.

- The EIS says traffic on ANZAC Bridge will increase by 2023 (p.8-103).

- Traffic modelling shows bus times will be slower into the city in the morning (p.3-19).

- The EIS identifies capacity constraints on ANZAC Bridge (p3-19). This project will dump more traffic onto the ANZAC Bridge.

- The statements made that public transport cannot serve diverse areas are empirically incorrect. The area the Westconnex is being built in has higher public transport mode use than the Greater Metropolitan Area as noted in the IES.

- The EIS notes that the project design and land use forecasts have changed significantly since the Stage 2 and Stage 3 EIS. However the cumulative analysis does not quantify the expected change on those roads. The EIS only notes significant increases in traffic volumes.

- I object to the whole project but particularly the tolls which are unfair when people living west of Parramatta really need alternative to western neighborhoods north-south. If we had better public transport then many of us would not have to drive and this would reduce the traffic.

- The modelling has thousands of unreleased cars at key locations; i.e. in reality those unreleased vehicles would result in vehicle queues and or network failure.

- The strategic model (whole system) inputs traffic volumes that simply cannot be accommodated in the road interchanges and feeder routes. It is physically impossible to fit that amount of traffic on a road.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: S M Badgery

Signature: 17 Sunshine Pde Culburra Beach

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: [illegible]

Suburb: ..... Postcode .....

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

* The proximity of two major Sydney Water Tunnels in the Newtown area, stating "Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water Assets". Why has an EIS been published that infers that the tunnel alignments have been thoroughly surveyed and researched, when further survey work could dramatically alter the alignments in the future ?

- Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.

- Permanent substation and water treatment plant - Residents on Darley Rd opposite the site and residents in Hubert St will have a direct line of site to the Motorway operation infrastructure. The resultant impact is a permanent degradation of the visual environment, is a loss of amenity and is detrimental to the community. This facility should not be permitted in this location and the EIS needs to demonstrate why it is required at this site. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site out of line of site of residents. The residual land should be returned for community purposes, such as green space, with future commercial uses ruled out. If the community is forced to endure 5 years of severe disruptions due to this toll road, the compensation should, at the very least, result in the land being returned to the community as green space.

- I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.

- The EIS does not provide any opportunity to comment on the urban design and landscape component of the project. It states that 'a detailed review and finalisation of the architectural treatment of the project operational infrastructure would be undertaken 'during detailed design'. The Community should be given an opportunity to comment upon and influence the design and we object to the approval of the EIS on the basis that this detail is not provided, nor is the community (or other stakeholders) given an opportunity to comment or influence the final design.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. "..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies

This is completely unacceptable

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: ROD TATE Signature: *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 69 PIPER ST Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

- *The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street will greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased by the time Stage 3 is completed. It states that Stage 3 will do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at Peak times. This will be highly negative for the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through the local areas on local streets.*

- *The business case for the project in all three stages has failed to taken into account the external costs of these massive road projects in air pollution for human and environmental health, in adding fossil fuel emissions to increase global warming effects, and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities, of displacement of people and businesses and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh any benefits from building roads which poorly serve people's transport needs but instead enrich private corporations.*

- *The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.*

- *Because this is still based on a "concept design" it is unknown how the communities affected will not know what is being done below their residences, schools, business premises and public spaces, particularly if the whole project is sold into a private corporation's ownership before the actual designs and construction plans are determined. The EIS makes references to these designs and plans being reviewed but there is **NO** information as to what agency will be responsible for such reviews or whether the outcomes of such reviews will be made public. The communities below whose homes, business premises, public buildings and public spaces this massive project will be excavated and built will be completely in the dark about what is being done, what standards it is supposed to comply with, what inspection or scrutiny it will subject to, and whether the private corporations undertaking the work will be held to any liability by our government.*

- *It is stated that if congestion proves to be a problem then other solutions will have to be found. Other routes that are being considered will be using the Western Distributor, the Crescent, Victoria Rd, Ross St, Pyrmont Bridge Rd and Johnston St. The Crescent and Johnston St are clearly going to be used. This despite the fact that in a consultation those representing Westconnex assured residents of Annandale that neither Johnston St or Booth St would be used. It is expected that these routes will also be used for night transport. It is clear that it is unlikely that transportation routes shown in the EIS will be adhered to. This is unacceptable.*

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: ROD YATES

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
***Declaration** : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 69 PIPER ST

Suburb: LICTFIELD Postcode 2040

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Many students walk or ride to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College schools via Darley Road.There are also a number of childcare centres very close to the Darley Road site.

- Because of the high tolls drivers who have to travel east daily will look for alternative routes and build up the traffic on local roads, both here in western Sydney, on Parramatta Rd and all the way to the city. There is no way the WestConnex roads will reduce traffic on un-tolled roads with tolls on the WestConnex sections so high.

- There will be 100 workers a day on the site, with provision for only 10-20 car spaces and there is a concession that local streets will be used, who will be 'encouraged' to use public transport. Our experience with the major construction sites in Haberfield, and St Peters that public transport is not used by the workers and that despite the fact they are not supposed to do so, they park in our local streets and cause strife with our residents.

- This EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain – and is certainly not included here.

- I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.

- Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, with predicted adverse impacts on breathing and through long-term carcinogenic effects. The maps and analysis of the pollution effects in the EIS should be presented in a way that enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.

Attention Director *Application Number: SSI 7485* *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001* *Application Name:* *WestConnex M4-M5 Link*	*Name:* ROD YATES *Signature:* ..... *Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 69 PIPER ST *Suburb:* LILYFIELD *Postcode* 2040

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

- The EIS (including Appendix H) fails to provide traffic modelling outputs to assess impacts of the Project on CBD streets and intersections. Given the highly constrained and congested nature of the CBD, NSW Government policy focusses on reducing the number of cars in the CBD in favour of public transport, walking and cycling. The proponent should provide intersection performance results for the following intersections:
  - The ANZAC Bridge off-ramp to Allen Street/Botany Road
  - The Western Distributor off-ramp to Druitt Street (buses)
  - The Western Distributor off-ramp to Bathurst Street
  - The Western Distributor off-ramp to King Street/Sussex Street
  - Gardeners Road and Botany Road
  - All intersections within the modelled area in the Sydney CBD

- The modelling process incorporates a highly unusual definition of induced traffic (p.45 of Appendix H). Induced traffic should not include the increase in trips due population growth and land use changes as these are modelled elsewhere.

- The traffic model used is an 'unconstrained' model. It assumes that all vehicles will travel on the route with the lowest "generalised cost" (i.e. combination of time and money). But it does not consider whether those routes have the capacity to handle all those vehicles. In the real world people change their time of travel, mode of travel and consider whether to make a trip at all to avoid congested routes. As a result travel patterns in the real world are very different to the patterns identified in models.

- The EIS notes that "in preparing the traffic staging plans during construction the key considerations (...) include maintaining traffic and lane capacity (...) on the arterial road network, particularly during peak periods; minimising impacts on public transport services (...); and minimising impacts on key active transport links". Existing capacity for both public and active modes of transport should be maintained. (P 8-70)

- The USA, UK and European states are more and more concerned about the bad effects of car emissions on people's health and are taking steps to tougher emission standards. Here the state government is promoting car use at the expense of public health concerns. I object to the WestConnex project because of the increased car emissions it will cause.

Attention Director *Application Number: SSI 7485* *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001* *Application Name:* *WestConnex M4-M5 Link*	*Name:* ROD YATES *Signature:* [signature] *Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.* *I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 65 PIPER ST *Suburb:* LILYFIELD *Postcode* 2040

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements fn project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail

- The Rozelle Rail Yards are a totally inappropriate area to create a new recreational area because the area will be highly polluted by unfiltered Pollution Stacks and Tunnel Portals. In the EIS it is referred to as an idealized area."It is envisaged that the quantum of active recreation within the Rozelle Rail Yards would be further developed by others as projects such as The Bays Precinct are developed. The concept plan provides spaces that could include an array of active recreation opportunities and even community facilities such as gardens or a school." The suggestion that this would be a suitable location for a School is just beyond belief and demonstrates that those who have put these plans together are either staggeringly ignorant or totally delusional! At a time when major World cities are doing all they can to address the dire problems of pollution this is an appalling suggestion that is totally out of touch.

- The EIS states that spoil handling at the Pyrmont Bridge Road Tunnel Site (C9) will "occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week" for about four years. Given the land use surrounding the site is dense residential, what mitigation measures will be used to control noise, light spill, etc. outside normal business hours? Have alternative living arrangements and/or compensation been considered? (P 8-55)

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: ROD YATES

Signature: 

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 69 PIPER ST

Suburb: CLIFFIELD Postcode 2040

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The EIS needs to provide specific detail as to what will be provided by way of alternative accommodation to the 36 residents identified as suffering extreme noise interference. There is no plan to temporarily relocate such residents, not to offer them financial compensation to enable them to move out during the worst period. There is an estimated 10 weeks of extreme noise during demolition of the commercial building and preparatory road works. Once this work is finished the residents will also be forced to endure a truck every 304 minutes for a period of five years. It is clearly not possible for such residents to continue to live in these houses and the EIS needs to detail what will be provided in terms of alternative living arrangements for part, or all of the construction work period.

- For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

- Hundreds of risks associated with this project have not been assessed but have instead been deferred to a detailed design stage into which the public will have no input. I call on the Department of Planning to reject this inadequate EIS that has been prepared by AECOM that has multiple commercial interests in WestConnex.

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

- Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years. The EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: ROD YATES

Signature:

*Please **Include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 69 PIPER ST

Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The EIS states that 'Impacts associated with property acquisition would be managed through a property acquisition support service.' There is no reference as to how this support service will be more effective than that currently offered. There were many upset residents and businesses who did not believe they were treated in a respectful and fair manner in earlier stages. The EIS needs to include details as to lessons learned from earlier projects and how this will be improved for the M4-M5 impacted residents and businesses. (Executive Summary xviii)

- I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.

- At very minimum, the assessment of Strategic Alternative 1 (improvements to the existing arterial road network) should:

- Identify key network capacity issues.
- Develop a scenario of investments in (potentially major) arterial road improvements required to address the road network capacity constraints. The City of Sydney's alternative scheme provides one example of what improvements to the existing arterial road network might look like.

- Carry out transport modelling and economic analysis to inform the assessment of the alternative.

- The removal of Buruwan Park between The Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Parade, Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a direct loss of much-needed parkland in this inner city area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a major cycle route from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD.

- I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

- It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The EIS Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.

- The presence of 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day at this site will create an unacceptable risk to students. The EIS should not be accepted.

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: ROD TATES

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 69 PIPER ST

Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.

- Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution– most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times

- The EIS does not mention the impact of aircraft noise and its cumulative impact. As such, the noise levels identified are misleading. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site because of the unacceptable noise impacts it will have on surrounding homes and businesses.

- This EIS provides no basis on which to approve such a complex project including the building of interchanges underneath Sydney suburbs Rozelle and Leichhardt. It would be absurd to approve the building of up to three tunnels under people's homes on the basis of such flimsy information

- The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link – in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area – in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other. The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area.

- The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: ROD YATES

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 65 PIPER ST

Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode: 2040

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Sydney ~~have~~ needs a real alternative in public transport. This is just gouging western Sydney road users to make the road attractive to a buyer.

- SMC is using an unpublished Value of Travel Time in the Westconnex traffic modelling. If the Value of Travel Time adopted is incorrect, then all outputs will be incorrect.

- The construction impact of the future Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link entry and exit ramps connecting to City West Link/The Crescent has been assessed. The operational traffic impact of these ramps has not. This should be completed and publicly released before determination. There is no verifiable or understandable data to determine the veracity of claims of traffic generated by these other links.

- SMC refuses to release the traffic model and detailed analysis for independent unpaid peer review and scenario analysis.The narrow boundaries of the areas of operational modelling mean the proponents have not fully assessed the Project's impacts on key strategic centres such as the Sydney Central Business District It is not understood why a mesoscopic modelling approach was not undertaken to gain a better understanding of impacts to the surrounding road network.

- Both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity. I object to the push for the M4-M5 link when there are still no plans for the Sydney Gateway to deal with the increased traffic.

- All traffic modelling is wrong, the question is: by how much? And what are the implications of the error? Incorrect traffic modelling has led to overoptimistic traffic predictions which resulted in low toll revenue from of the Cross City Tunnel, Lane Cove Tunnel and Brisconnex in Brisbane, resulting in eventual bankruptcy. The traffic modelling process used to develop the Project is fundamentally flawed because:
- Traffic projections are likely to be significantly different to the actual traffic on the street network
- Traffic volumes projected in the model are in numerous instances well above the physical capacity of the road network.

- I object to this new tollway project because it will not reduce traffic, simply move it around. If they were serious about reducing traffic in Parramatta Rd they would put a toll on it and make the new roads free to encourage the traffic to use the

Attention Director *Application Number: SSI 7485* *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001* *Application Name:* *WestConnex M4-M5 Link*	*Name:* ROD YATES *Signature:*  *Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 69 PIPER ST *Suburb:* LILYFIELD *Postcode* 2040

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

- The nature of proposed "post-opening mitigation measures" (Page 223, Chapter 9.8, Appendix H) are unknown and their impacts could be significant including intersection and road widening (and associated property loss), banning parking in local centres, removal of trees, footpaths and cycling facilities. The people of NSW have a reasonable expectation to understand whether such impacts form part of the Project and they should be detailed in the EIS. They should not be left to a "wait and see" approach. Not only a proper analysis of demand, but also of traffic dispersion should be provided for connecting roads up to three kilometres from every exit and entry portal and the capacity of those roads analysed.

- Road congestion is reducing bus performance and reliability. The project will make it worse.

- The EIS says traffic on ANZAC Bridge will increase by 2023 (p.8-103).

- Traffic modelling shows bus times will be slower into the city in the morning (p.3-19).

- The EIS identifies capacity constraints on ANZAC Bridge (p3-19). This project will dump more traffic onto the ANZAC Bridge.

- The statements made that public transport cannot serve diverse areas are empirically incorrect. The area the Westconnex is being built in has higher public transport mode use than the Greater Metropolitan Area as noted in the IES.

- The EIS notes that the project design and land use forecasts have changed significantly since the Stage 2 and Stage 3 EIS. However the cumulative analysis does not quantify the expected change on those roads. The EIS only notes significant increases in traffic volumes.

- I object to the whole project but particularly the tolls which are unfair when people living west of Parramatta really need alternative to western neighborhoods north-south. If we had better public transport then many of us would not have to drive and this would reduce the traffic.

- The modelling has thousands of unreleased cars at key locations; i.e. in reality those unreleased vehicles would result in vehicle queues and or network failure.

- The strategic model (whole system) inputs traffic volumes that simply cannot be accommodated in the road interchanges and feeder routes. It is physically impossible to fit that amount of traffic on a road.

Attention Director *Application Number: SSI 7485* *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001* *Application Name:* *WestConnex M4-M5 Link*	*Name:* ROD YATES *Signature:* *Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.* *I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 69 PIPER ST *Suburb:* LILYFIELD *Postcode* 2040

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- The EIS uses criteria to assess the impact of existing walking and cycling routes that will need to be diverted as a result of the M4-M5 Link. The criteria are based on distance only and exclude the additional travel time taken to complete the diversion. This approach is flawed and should also consider travel time – if it did, this would completely change the assessment of the proposed removal of the existing pedestrian and cycle bridge over City West Link. (P 8-71, Table 8-50). Further, the EIS is silent as to whether the existing pedestrian and cycle bridge over City West Link will be replaced post-construction (P 8-73)

- The assessment of Strategic Alternative 3 (Travel Demand Management) should:

  - Identify key network capacity issues
  - Consider the opportunity for travel demand management measures to address the road network capacity constraints. The measure should aim to retime, re-mode or reduce trips that make less productive use of congested road space.
  - Draw on a process of multi-modal transport modelling and economic assessment to inform the analysis and assessment

- The EIS does not provide appropriate parking for the estimated 100 or so workers that the EIS states will work every day at the site, while other equivalent sites have allocated parking for such workers (Northcote Civil site (150)) and Parramatta Road East Civil site (140). It is also noted that the EIS provides for loss of 20 residential parks on Darley Road. Local streets are at capacity already because of the lack of off-street parking for many residents and the Light Rail stop which means that commuters use local streets. The EIS states that workers 'will be encouraged to use public transport.' the EIS needs to mandate that no trucks or construction vehicles are to park in local streets. There needs to be a requirement that is enforceable that workers use the Light Rail stop which is adjacent to the site or a plan to bus in workers

- I oppose the removal of further homes of Significance in either Haberfield or Ashfield. The level of destruction has already been appalling. Residents were led to expect that there would be no further construction impacts after the completion of the M4 East. The loss of further houses of the community will cause further distress within this community.

- The Rozelle Interchange will prevent major redevelopment in the Rozelle area. This area has been identified by the NSW Government as a major opportunity for urban renewal for over 20 years. Light construction vehicle routes – the EIS acknowledges that these vehicles will use 'dispersed' routes (8-62). In other words, construction vehicles will use and park on local roads. The EIS does not propose any management as to which roads they use.

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: ROD YATES Signature: *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 69 PIPER ST Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

- *Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates and unacceptable risk of damage to homes due to settlement (ground movement). The EIS acknowledges that at tunnelling at 35 metres and less this is a real risk. There is no mitigation provided for this risk. Instead, it states that properties will be repaired at the Government's expense. However no details or assurance as to how this will occur are provided. The project should not be approved with such tunnelling depths permitted and with no detail as to the extent of damage and how and when it will be repaired. It will lead to the situation where residents and businesses are forced to engage structural engineers and lawyers to prove that the damage was linked to Westconnex works, with no assurance that this property damage will be promptly and satisfactorily fixed.*

- *Heavy vehicle movements during peak hours – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'reasonable and practical management strategies would be investigated to minimize the volume of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours.' (8-53). This is also not acceptable as it is not known what will actually be done to manage this impact. It is not good enough for the EIS, which forms the basis of the approval of this project, to simply mention 'investigations' and not detail a proper plan (on which residents can comment) on management of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours. In addition, Darley Road is very congested from 7am until 9.30am and then from 4pm-6.30pm, well outside the 'peak' periods identified in the EIS. And the impact on traffic will be caused by 'light' vehicles and not simply heavy vehicles. It is clear that there is no plan for managing these vehicle movements. The EIS should not be approved as drafted. It is unacceptable for this volume of vehicles to be proposed for this critical arterial road with no plan for management*

- *EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. "The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in **Chapter 1**, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.*

I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: ROD YATES

Signature: 

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 69 PIPER ST

Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

◊ The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)

◊ The EIS states that the Rozelle interchange and the surrounds of the Anzac Bridge are currently close to capacity. With the proposed project construction the area is going to be subjected to a huge increase in vehicle movements throughout the area for 5 years. Even the 'with project' scenario states that this area will experience no improvement and if anything the current situation will be worse. This is totally unacceptable and proves that the whole project is a complete White Elephant. Indeed it is stated in the EIS that the only way to mitigate for this situation by 2033 is for the working population to adjust their work hours. "Due to forecast congestion, some of this traffic is predicted not to be able to start or finish their journey within the peak period. Some drivers will therefore choose to make their journey either earlier or later in the peak period to avoid delay. This behavior is called 'peak spreading'. . ." This is a categorical admission of failure of this complete project and a stupendous waste of Tax Payers money.

◊ The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it. This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

◊ The mechanical ventilation proposed depends on single direction tunnel construction, so how it can possibly work for large curved tunnels on multiple levels is unknown.

◊ Worker parking – Leichhardt. There is provision in the EIS for only a dozen worker car parks and no provision for the 100 or so workers who will be permanently based at the Darley Road site for up to five years. A major construction site project should not be permitted in a neighbourhood area without allocated parking for all workers. No other business would be permitted to be established without this requirement being satisfied – why is it acceptable for this project? In addition, the EIS proposes the removal of 20 car spaces used by residents on Darley Road and will remove the 'kiss and ride' facility at the light rail stop. This will result in residents being unable to park in their own street and will increase noise impacts from workers doing shift changeovers 24 hours a day.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: ROD YATES

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 69 PIPER ST

Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

• SMC SHOULD NOT •

permit any truck movements near the Darley Road site. The alternative proposal which provides that all spoil trucks enter and leave from the City West link is the only proposal that should be considered.

- (6-51) The EIS needs to mandate that these measures are in place. Where mentioned, the acoustic shed that is considered offers the lower grade noise protection. This is despite the fact that 36 'sensitive receivers' are identified in the EIS, who will have extreme noise disturbance through much of the 5-year construction period. In addition, the acoustic shed covers only the spoil and spoil handling area and not the tunnel entrances and exits. The highest level of noise protection, which is only suggested in the EIS, needs to be mandated in the EIS. In addition, the shed needs to cover both the entrance and exit to the site and not simply the spoil handling areas. The independent engineer's report (commissioned by the Inner West council) states that it is likely, because of the elevated position of the site, that it is likely an acoustic shed will not contain the noise to an acceptable level. In addition, a temporary access tunnel will be built from the top of the site and run directly under homes in James Street. These homes will be unacceptably impacted by the construction noise and truck movements without these additional measures
- It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?
- The widening of the Crescent between the City West link and Johnston St with an extra lane being constructed will lead to heavy traffic congestion. This will be exacerbated still further by extra traffic light control cycles being incorporated into the signaling at both Johnston St and at the City West Link, with the inclusion of an extra traffic light control 400m West from the Crescent / City West Link junction to manage the movement of large numbers of spoil trucks.
- The EIS at 7-21 states that Community update Newsletters were distributed to residents 'near the project footprint' in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses 'letterboxed'. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.
- The EIS at 12-57 describes possible disruptions of water supply to a vast area of Sydney as a result of tunnelling in the

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: ROD YATES
	Address: 69 PIPER ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.*
***Declaration** – I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

⇒ The key intersection performance tables in App H (p.258 St Peters and 248 Rozelle) demonstrate that many intersections will either worsen (at the worst case scenario of LOS F) or remain unchanged particularly in 2033, including the following intersections:

- Princes Highway/Canal Road
- Princes Highway/Railway Road
- Unwins Bridge Road/Campbell Street
- Campbell Road/Bourke Road
- Princes Highway/Campbell Street
- Ricketty Street/Kent Road
- Gardeners Road/Kent Road
- Gardeners Road/Bourke Road
- Gardeners Rd/O'Riordan Street
- Victoria Road/Lyons Road
- Victoria Road/Darling Street
- Victoria Road/Robert Street

⇒ I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.

⇒ The proponent excludes the impact of the Western Sydney Airport from analysis of the project. This could have a significant impact on traffic volumes.

⇒ The modelling shows significant increases in traffic on Victoria Rd (+20% ADT) which is already at capacity.

⇒ Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

⇒ Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

⇒ The modelling shows the motorway exceeds reasonable operating limits in the peak in less than ten years.

⇒ The underlying traffic modelling and outputs was insufficient to:

- Demonstrate the need for the project.
- Understand impacts of dispersed traffic on connecting roads, such as the Anzac Bridge, and whether they have available capacity to meet the predicted traffic discharge. Any congestion on exits has the capacity to negate all travel time savings to the exit point, given the small predicted benefits.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: ROD YATES
	Address: 69 PIPER ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

1. The key intersection performance tables in App H (p.258 St Peters and 248 Rozelle) demonstrate that many intersections will either worsen (at the worst case scenario of LOS F) or remain unchanged particularly in 2033, including the following intersections:
   - Princes Highway/Canal Road
   - Princes Highway/Railway Road
   - Unwins Bridge Road/Campbell Street
   - Campbell Road/Bourke Road
   - Princes Highway/Campbell Street
   - Ricketty Street/Kent Road
   - Gardeners Road/Kent Road
   - Gardeners Road/Bourke Road
   - Gardeners Rd/O'Riordan Street
   - Victoria Road/Lyons Road
   - Victoria Road/Darling Street
   - Victoria Road/Robert Street

2. I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.

3. The proponent excludes the impact of the Western Sydney Airport from analysis of the project. This could have a significant impact on traffic volumes.

4. The modelling shows significant increases in traffic on Victoria Rd (+20% ADT) which is already at capacity.

5. Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

6. Most people in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, or Blacktown who work in Sydney CBD use the trains. What workers travelling to Sydney city really need are better and more frequent trains. This is just dismissed by the EIS.

7. The modelling shows the motorway exceeds reasonable operating limits in the peak in less than ten years.

8. The underlying traffic modelling and outputs was insufficient to:
   - Demonstrate the need for the project.
   - Understand impacts of dispersed traffic on connecting roads, such as the Anzac Bridge, and whether they have available capacity to meet the predicted traffic discharge. Any congestion on exits has the capacity to negate all travel time savings to the exit point, given the small predicted benefits.

9. Public transport is rejected by the EIS so the state government is forcing us to use cars more when most major cities in the world are trying to reduce the number of cars on the roads. We know this is to promote private road operators' profits. I object to putting so much public funding to the cause of private profit. I urge the Secretary of Planning to reject this project.

Submission to: Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW 2001 Attention: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: No WestCONnex Annandale Community Group co convenors & committee members Richard Dudley-Smith Sally Hardy Address: 374 Annandale Street, Annandale NSW 2038 Signature:  Email: 
Date: 15 October 2017	Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
	Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the late 2 years.

We strongly object to this proposal for the Westconnex M4- M5 link. This Environmental Impact Statement which is 'indicative only' should not be approved.

In the SMH Oct 12th it says that the Rozelle Interchange is now not going to be built as it is shown in the design plan in the EIS for Stage 3 but no detailed plans of what is now going to be built are provided.

I demand that the Rozelle Interchange be taken out of this EIS. Which in turn makes the current EIS invalid.

If this EIS is approved as it currently stands including this now not to be built design it would mean that anything can be built instead of the Rozelle Interchange as it has been presented to the public, meaning the community will have had no opportunity to revue or object to what is being considered.

This is completely unacceptable.

If this EIS is approved in it's current form it will be a totally corrupt abuse of the legal requirements for planning approvals.

It should be open to legal challenge.

We demand that the Minister of Planning does not sign off on this EIS and another EIS is prepared either excluding the Rozelle Interchange entirely, or a new EIS is prepared showing exactly what the design will be and what is to be proposed for the interchange construction in Rozelle.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Lisa Kmanuel
	Address: 19 Ainsworth Street
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Lilyfield Postcode 2040.
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The latest EIS was released just ten business days after feedback period ended for the Concept Design for the M4/M5 and before preliminary drilling to establish a route through the Inner West is completed. WHAT IS THE RUSH? This EIS is little more than a concept design and is far less developed than earlier ones. It is composed of many indicate only plans such that it is impossible to know what the impacts will be and yet approval is being sought in a rush. The EIS ignores more than 1500 submissions, including one of 142 pages from the Inner West Council.
- One toll road leads to another 3 being proposed. The EIS's for the M4 East and the New M5 argued the case that serious congestion created near interchanges would be solved once the M4/M5 was built. Now it seems this is not the case and more roads will be needed to relieve the congestion – WHERE DOES THIS END? According to the M4/M5 EIS the real benefits will depend on building the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Airport Link and a tollway heading South. None of these projects have been planned, let alone approved but yet are part of addressing the congestion impacts acknowledged for the M4/M5link project. Given this how is it possible to know or address the impacts of the M4/M5 Link, unless this is just yet more justification for yet more roads?
- Research about roads clearly demonstrates that roads create congestion. The WestConnex project is no different and the EIS clearly indicates that this is an impact of the M4/M5 and the consequent roads that will follow. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE m4/m5 Link EIS itself indicates the RMS is already hard at work considering how to solve these problems – of congestion caused by roads.
- Where is the commitment to community consultation and to long term planning when the EIS for the M4/M5 Link is released before any response to the extensive community feedback on the M4-M5 Link concept design could possibly have been seriously considered. This demonstrates deep government contempt for the people of NSW and the communities of the Inner West of Sydney in particular.
- The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.
- For example, the AECOM EIS for the New M5 failed to deal with how the massively contaminated land fill at Alexandria would be managed during construction. After months of sickening odours, the NSW EPA admits that despite fining SMC and requiring contractors to take measures to control odours, they have not stopped. It acknowledges that it does not have the power to stop work until WestConnex contractors comply with environmental regulations.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: STEFAN SORGE
	Address: 6/34 GOLDS AVE
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please Include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

a. I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.

b. I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.

c. Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)

d. Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat – the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.

e. I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

f. I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director *Application Number: SSI 7485* *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001* *Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link*	*Name:* Stefan Szecsi *Signature:* *Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.* *I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 6/34 Gowrie Av *Suburb:* Leichhardt *Postcode* 2049

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

i. The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.

ii. In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.

iii. The RMS has previously identified the Darley Rd site in Leichhardt as the third most dangerous traffic hazard in the Inner West. The NSW Land and Environment Court found that the location of the site couldn't safely deal with 60 bottle truck movements a week, but the M4/M5 EIS shows that more than 800 vehicles including hundreds of heavy ones will use the site each day as part of construction of M4M5 Link. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why are the already acknowledged impacts being ignored.

iv. It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.

v. The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.

vi. EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director *Application Number: SSI 7485* *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001* *Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link*	*Name:* STEFAN SAGER *Signature:* *Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.* *I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 6/34 Gow Street *Suburb:* Lewisham *Postcode* 2049

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used. The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is . therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents.NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: A. Simpson Signature: A Simpson *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 24 Kent St. Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2042	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.

- The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.

- The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.

- I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

- The EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4M5 get approval will worsen traffic congestions on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it would be outrageous for motorists to be asked to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.

- Streets in Haberfield would be subject to heavy vehicle traffic for a further four years, making at least 7 years of heavy impacts on a single suburb. The answer is not a "community strategy'. Residents who believed that their pain would be over after the M4 east are now being asked to sustain a further four years of impacts. No compensation or serious mitigation is suggested.

- The EIS acknowledges that four years of M4/M5 construction would have a negative economic and social impact across the Inner West through interrupted traffic routes, slower traffic times, disruption with public transport, interruption with businesses and loss of connections across communities. This finding highlights the need for a proper cost benefit analysis for the project. Such social costs should not simply be dismissed with the promise of a construction plan into which the community has not input or powers to enforce.

- I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Sherden De Aiorgo
	Address: 12 Mittagong St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Enoggera Postcode 4051
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: S. De Aiorgo
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- **I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.**

- **I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.**

- **Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)**

- **Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat – the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.**

- **I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.**

- **I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.**

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Jordan Pittoors

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 32 Vale St

Suburb: Woodpark Postcode 2164

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485 Application

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

a) The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage

b) I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.

c) Insufficient time has been given for the community to prepare submissions to the EIS, especially when one considers that whole neighbourhoods affected by the project were not even notified during the concept design period. e.g Newtown, east of King St.

d) The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other. The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area.

e) The mechanical ventilation proposed depends on single direction tunnel construction, so how it can possibly work for large curved tunnels on multiple levels is unknown.

f) The EIS proposes removal of all vegetation on the Darley Road site. There is a mature tree located on the site which serves as a visual and noise barrier to the heavy City West Link traffic. Removal of this tree and other vegetation will increase noise impacts to nearby residents and affect the visual amenity, with homes having a direct line of sight to the City West Link. The existing mature tree needs to be retained on this and environmental grounds.

g) The EIS needs to provide specific detail as to what will be provided by way of alternative accommodation to the 36 residents identified as suffering extreme noise interference. There is no plan to temporarily relocate such residents, not to offer them financial compensation to enable them to move out during the worst period. There is an estimated 10 weeks of extreme noise during demolition of the commercial building and preparatory road works. Once this work is finished the residents will also be forced to endure a truck every 304 minutes for a period of five years. It is clearly not possible for such residents to continue to live in these houses and the EIS needs to detail what will be provided in terms of alternative living arrangements for part, or all of the construction work period.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: KATE COATES
	Address: 1/14 WARREN RD
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: MARRICKVILLE Postcode 2204
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

I. *I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents.NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.*

II. *The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.*

III. *The business case for the project in all three stages has failed to taken into account the external costs of these massive road projects in air pollution for human and environmental health, in adding fossil fuel emissions to increase global warming effects, and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities, of displacement of people and businesses and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh any benefits from building roads which poorly serve people's transport needs but instead enrich private corporations.*

IV. *The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.*

V. *The EIS states that, if the current proposal for ventilation facilities do not manage to achieve satisfactory environmental and health impacts, that further ventilation facilities may be proposed. This is unacceptable and the EIS does not provide the alternative locations for any such facilities and therefore the community is deprived of any opportunity to comment on their impacts. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be additional ventilation facilities that are not disclosed in the EIS.*

VI. *It is clear that the tunnel portals will be major sites for more traffic congestion. Some intersections that are currently very congested will be just as bad in 2033.*

VII. *Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years. The EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.*

VIII. *The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.*

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Owen Small
	Address: 92 Dunbar Street
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Hurlstone Park Postcode 2193
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters, Haberfield and Rozelle Interchanges will disrupt local transport networks including bus and active transport (walking and cycling)

- There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

- Out of hours work - Pyrmont Bridge Road site - Up to 14 'receivers' at this site are predicted to have impacts from high noise impacts during out of hours work for construction and pavement works for approximately 2 weeks caused by the use of a rock-breaker. Again, no plans to relocate or compensate residents affected is provided in the EIS (EIS, XV) The only mitigation contained in the EIS is that the use of the road profiler is to be limited during out of hours works 'where feasible.' (Table 5-120) In other words, there is no mitigation whatsoever for residents affected by daytime noise and a possibility that they will be similarly affected out of hours where the contractor considers that it isn't feasible to limit the use of the road profiler. This represents an inadequate response to managing these severe noise impacts for residents.

- Targets for renewable energy and offsets are unclear

- Noise from trucks entering and exiting the site - Pyrmont Bridge Road site - The EIS states that there will be noise 'exceedances' for trucks entering and exiting the site (Table 5-120) No detail is provided as to the level of any such 'exceedance'. Nor does it propose any mitigation other than investigations into 'locations' where hoarding above 2 metres can be utilized to control trucks in the queuing area. This does not result in any firm plans to manage the noise. Nor is enough detail provided so that those affected can comment on the effectiveness of this proposed mitigation measure

- Increased traffic on Bridge Road, Wattle Street and the Western Distributor will reduce the amenity and value of the investment in the renewal of the Fish Markets and renewal of the Bays Market District

- Despite the promise of the WestConnex business case, Parramatta Road remains a barrier to urban revitalisation. There is no discussion of this commitment in the EIS.

- The EIS states that the risk of ground settlement is lessened where tunnelling is more that 35m (EIS Vol 2B App E p1). Yet the depths of tunnelling in

---

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: Nella van Veenendaal

Signature: Nella Van

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 3 Excelsior pde

Suburb: Mayvillle Postcode 2204

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.

- The EIS states that darley Road is a contaminated site, and likely has asbestos. The proposal is that 'treated' water will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. We object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons. There is no detail of the ongoing Motorway maintenance activities during operation provided in the EIS. The community therefore cannot comment on the impact that this ongoing facility will have on the locality. This component of the EIS should not be approved as this information is not provided and therefore impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not known.

- The removal of spoil at the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to the largest amount of Spoil truck movements on the entire Stage 3 project: 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place at Peak hours. There will also be 10 Heavy truck movements a day from the Crescent Civil Site. The sheer number of trucks on the road will lead to massive increases in congestion. Maps in the EIS have the spoil trucks going to and from these sites from the Haberfield direction on the City West Link. This is also the direction that is being proposed for spoil truck movements from Darley Rd which is said to have 100 Heavy truck movements a day. It is stated that the cumulative effect of truck movements from all sites on the City West Link will be 700 (one way) Heavy truck movements a day and of that 208 will be in Peak hours. This plan totally lacks credibility

- Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.

- In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.

- Permanent water treatment plant and substation – Leichhardt The proposal to locate this permanent structure in a residential setting is opposed. The site will have a negative visual impact on the area and is in direct line of sight of a number of homes. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site further from homes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Steve Doherty

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 1202/177-219 Mitchell Rd

Suburb: Erskineville Postcode 2043

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.

- The EIS currently permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the site (and based on experience with cars accessing the site for Dan Murphy's), queuing will be the norm and not the exception. The EIS needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads

- SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

- The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

- I object to the location of a permanent substation and water treatment plant following the completion of the project on the Darley Road site. This will limit the future uses of the land and the community has been continually assured that the land, which is Government-owned, would be available for community purposes. The presence of this facility will forever prevent the ability for safe and direct pedestrian access to the light rail stop, with users required to walk down a dark and winding path. It will also limit the future use of the site. If a permanent facility is to be located then it should be moved to the north of the site so that it is out of sight of homes and has less visual impact on residents.

- I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.

- I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director *Application Number: SSI 7485* *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001* *Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link*	*Name:* JANET KELF *Signature:* [signature] *Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 5 GIBBES ST *Suburb:* NEWTOWN *Postcode* 2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- There have been widespread reports in the media about extensive unresolved disputes regarding damages to houses in the Stage 1 M4 and Stage 2 M5 construction process. Why should the community believe that there will not be extensivedamages to houses in Stage 3 ?
- Because this is still based on a "concept design" it is unknown how the communities affected will not know what is being done below their residences, schools, business premises and public spaces, particularly if the whole project is sold into a private corporation's ownership before the actual designs and construction plans are determined. The EIS makes references to these designs and plans being reviewed but there is **NO** information as to what agency will be responsible for such reviews or whether the outcomes of such reviews will be made public. The communities below whose homes, business premises, public buildings and public spaces this massive project will be excavated and built will be completely in the dark about what is being done, what standards it is supposed to comply with, what inspection or scrutiny it will subject to, and whether the private corporations undertaking the work will be held to any liability by our government.
- It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The EIS Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.
- It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- I am concerned that SMC has selected one of Sydney's most dangerous traffic spots, Darley Rd in Leichhardt for a construction site that will bring hundreds of extra trucks and cars into the area on a daily basis for years.
- The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.
- I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.
- The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.
- I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.
- The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link – in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area – in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other. The increasing numbers of vehicles will also increase the vehicle pollution (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic) in this area.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: M J de MERINDOL

Signature: [signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 20 Saber St.

Suburb: Woollahra *Postcode* 2025

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

- Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.

- The Darley Road site will not be returned after the project, with a substantial portion permanently housing a Motorways Operations facility which involves a substation and water treatment plant. This means that the residents will not be able to directly access the North Light rail Station from Darley Road but will have to traverse Canal Road and use the narrow path from the side. In addition the presence of this facility reduces the utility of this vital land which could be turned into a community facility. Over the past 12 months community representatives were repeatedly told that the land would be returned and this has not occurred. We also object to the location of this type of infrastructure in a neighbourhood setting.

- Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.

- It all very difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.

- *Traffic diversions - Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-66). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents. Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.*

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Sebastian Hardy
	Address: 11 Don St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

a) The management of water in the Rozelle Yards is of great concern as the site is highly contaminated and the construction work that will be carried out will cause a great deal of disturbance especially once vegetation has been removed. There will be potential impacts from contaminated soils, leakage/spills of hydrocarbons and other chemicals from machinery, vehicles transporting spoil adjacent to roads and stormwaters, rinse water from plant washing and concrete slurries. Water from tunnelling activity and other works will also introduce contaminants. The EIS says that much of this water will be treated in temporary treatment facilities and sediment tanks before being released to Whites Creek and Rozelle Bay. The EIS does not disclose what levels of pollution controls will be implemented to make sure that contaminated water is not released into White's Creek or Rozelle Bay. This is not acceptable.

b) In 2033 with the M4 - M5 link the WRTM is forecasting reductions in peak travel times between the M4 corridor and the Sydney Airport/Port Botany area. The times savings that are quoted miniscule! Between Parramatta and Sydney Airport the time saving is 10 minutes. Between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saving is 5 minutes. Between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saving is 10 minutes. So for well over $20Billion all that can be saved is just a handful of minutes! This total waste of public money is completely unacceptable.

c) I object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site because of the unacceptable risk it will create to the safety of our community. Darley Road is a known accident and traffic blackspot and the movements of hundreds of trucks a day will create an unacceptable risk of accidents. On Transport for NSW's own figures, the intersection at the City West Link and James Street is the third most dangerous in the inner west.

d) EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. "*The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in* ***Chapter 1****, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval*". The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: SUSANA SENECO Address: 48 CRYSTAL ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: PETERSHAM Postcode 2049
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Leichhardt Environmental issues - Substation and water treatment plant**
   The EIS proposes that 'treated' water from the tunnel will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. We object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons.
2. **Presence of Substation and water treatment plant - Leichhardt**
   There is no detail in the EIS about the impact of the ongoing Motorway maintenance activities during operation provided (noise, vibrations, hours of operation, workers on site etc). The community therefore cannot comment on the impact that this permanent facility will have on the amenity of the area. The erection of this facility should not be approved in the basis that no information is provided and therefore impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not known.
3. **Out-of-hours and night work - Leichhardt**
   Because Darley Rd is highly congested during day time, it is likely there will be frequent out of hours and night work. The EIS as drafted effectively permits out of hours to be undertaken whenever this is convenient to the contractor. This will create an unacceptable impact on those living close to the site. The approval conditions need to prohibit out of hours and night work except in genuine exceptional circumstances (for example, a risk to life). It is unacceptable to not provide limits and clear rules on such work.
4. **Flooding – Leichhardt**
   The EIS states that there may be impacts from flooding which, amongst other things, may disrupt drainage systems. Darley Road is in a flood zone and there have been ongoing issued with flooding requiring remedial work. This proposal creates an unacceptable risk of flooding and associated damage and a major tunnelling site should not be permitted on this site on this ground. There is no detail as to how the issues with flooding at Darley Road will be managed and on their potential impact on the area.
   Disruption to road network – Leichhardt
5. **Disruption to road network**
   The EIS states that there will be 'impacts' 'that would affect the efficiency of the road network.' No detail is provided in the EIS as to how cars will be able to access and cross the City West Link once 170 vehicles (heavy and light) access the site on a daily basis. it belies common sense how this can even be considered, given its impact on commuter times.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attention: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: Janelle Taylor Signature: Jtaylor *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 3/310 Elswick St North Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

- Environmental issues – contamination – Leichhardt: The EIS states that Darley Road is a contaminated site; likely including asbestos. There is a risk to the community associated with spoil removal, transfer and handling. We object to the selection of the site based on the environmental risks that this creates, along with risks to health of residents.

- Location of permanent Motorway operations complex on Darley Road – Leichhardt: We strongly object to the proposed location of this permanent operational facility on Darley Road. The presence of this site contradicts repeated assurances to the community that the site would be returned after construction was completed. The ongoing presence of this site will limit future uses of the darley Road site which could serve community purposes, particularly given its location directly next to public transport. Its presence removes the ability to provide more accessible, safer and direct pedestrian access to the North Leichhardt Light Rail Station. The plant location, in a neighbourhood setting is not appropriate. It will reduce property values and have an unacceptable impacts on the visual amenity of the area. The streets adjacent to Darley Road are comprised of low-rise residential homes and small businesses and infrastructure such as this should not be permitted in such a location.

- Alternative housing for residents – Leichhardt: The EIS needs to provide specific detail as to what will be provided by way of alternative accommodation to the 36 residents identified as suffering extreme noise interference. There is no plan to temporarily relocate such residents, not to offer them financial compensation to enable them to move out during the worst period. There is an estimated 10 weeks of extreme noise during demolition of the commercial building and preparatory road works. Once this work is finished the residents will also be forced to endure a truck every 304 minutes for a period of five years. It is clearly not possible for such residents to continue to live in these houses and the EIS needs to detail what will be provided in terms of alternative living arrangements for part, or all of the construction work period.

- Access tunnel from Darley Road – Leichhardt: The EIS contains no detail of the access tunnel from the Darley Road site to the mainline tunnel other than depicting the route. The approval conditions need to ensure that tunnelling is occurring at sufficient depth so as to not jeopardise the integrity of the homes and not create unacceptable vibration and noise impacts for James Street residents and those at adjacent streets. The approval conditions need to make clear the period of time for which the 'temporary' tunnel is to be used.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attention: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: Janelle Taylor Signature: Jtaylor *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 3/310 Elswick St Nth Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

- Current noise measures – Leichhardt: The EIS states that 'reasonable and feasible work practices and mitigation measures would be implemented to minimise potential noise impacts due to activities occurring at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site.' 96-52) This is not good enough. The EIS does not contain any detail whatsoever of these proposal on which they can comment. In addition, there is no requirement that measures will in fact be introduced to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain detail of specific noise mitigation measures that are mandated and can be enforced.

- Acoustic shed – Leichhardt: The EIS does not require an acoustic shed and states that 'Acoustic barriers and devices at the access tunnel entrances would be considered and implemented where reasonable and feasible to minimise potential noise impacts associated with out-of-hours works within the tunnels.' (6-51) The EIS needs to mandate that these measures are in place. Where mentioned, the acoustic shed that is considered offers the lower grade noise protection. This is despite the fact that 36 'sensitive receivers' are identified in the EIS, who will have extreme noise disturbance through much of the 5-year construction period. In addition, the acoustic shed covers only the spoil and spoil handling area and not the tunnel entrances and exits. The highest level of noise protection, which is only suggested in the EIS, needs to be mandated in the EIS. In addition, the shed needs to cover both the entrance and exit to the site and not simply the spoil handling areas. The independent engineer's report (commissioned by the Inner West council) states that it is likely, because of the elevated position of the site, that it is likely an acoustic shed will not contain the noise to an acceptable level. In addition, a temporary access tunnel will be built from the top of the site and run directly under homes in James Street. These homes will be unacceptably impacted by the construction noise and truck movements without these additional measures.

- Return of the site after construction – Leichhardt: The Darley Road site will not be returned after the project, with a substantial portion permanently housing a Motorways Operations facility which involves a substation and water treatment plant. This means that the residents will not be able to directly access the North Light rail Station from Darley Road but will have to traverse Canal Road and use the narrow path from the side. In addition the presence of this facility reduces the utility of this vital land which could be turned into a community facility. Over the past 12 months community representatives were repeatedly told that the land would be returned and this has not occurred. We also object to the location of this type of infrastructure in a neighbourhood setting.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Janelle Taylor Signature: J Taylor
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 3/310 Elswick St Nth Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

- Management of potential impacts – Leichhardt: The EIS states that a Construction traffic and Access Management plan (CTAMP) would be prepared to minimise delays and disruptions and identify changes to ensure road safety. The plans are not in the EIS so residents cannot comment. The EIs should be rejected on the basis that the impacts on traffic and safety are not adequately addressed. It is inadequate to simply refer to a plan, with no provision for residents and other key stakeholders to be involved in its development.

- Local road diversions and closures – Leichhardt: The EIS states that these will occur near the Darley Road site. There is no detail provided, nor is there a process by which residents can influence such decisions. The Inner West Council's documents state that Darley Road is not built to normal road requirements and safety standards, as it was established as an access road for the former goods line. Two fatalities have occurred near the site location, with many accidents. The Council has been trying to make Darley Road a safer route for many years. Elwick Street North for example was partially closed as a result of a fatality. The approval conditions need to make it clear that all road closures need to be made in consultation with residents affected and that the safety issues are adequately addressed. No arterial traffic from Darley Road should be allowed to be diverted onto narrow local roads.

- Environmental issues - Substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt: The EIS states that darley Road is a contaminated site, and likely has asbestos. The proposal is that 'treated' water will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. We object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons. There is no detail of the ongoing Motorway maintenance activities during operation provided in the EIS. The community therefore cannot comment on the impact that this ongoing facility will have on the locality. This component of the EIS should not be approved as this information is not provided and therefore impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not known.

- Flooding – Leichhardt: The EIS states that there may be impacts from flooding which, amongst other things, may disrupt drainage systems. There is no detail as to how the issues with flooding at Darley Road will be managed and on their potential impact on the area. (Executive Summary, xxi)

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: ALAN TRMELKOV Address: 137/69 ALLEN STREET LEICHHARDT
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Traffic diversions – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents. Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.
2. **Permanent water treatment plant and substation – Leichhardt** The proposal to locate this permanent structure in a residential setting is opposed. The site will have a negative visual impact on the area and is in direct line of sight of a number of homes. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site further from homes.
3. **Discharge of water into storm water at Blackmore Oval – Leichhardt** The permanent substation and water treatment plant proposed for the Darley Road site facility should not be approved as part of the EIS. It proposes discharging water from the tunnels into the storm water canal near Blackmore Oval. This will devastate our waterways and impact negatively on the amenity of the bay which has four rowing clubs in close proximity. In addition, the environmental impacts of this discharge are not properly set out in the EIS.
4. **Impacts not provided – Permanent water treatment plant and substation** – The EIS states that there will be an office, worker parking and buildings to accommodate this facility on a permanent basis. It does not provide any detail as to – noise impacts, numbers of workers on site, any health risks associated with the facility. This is simply inadequate and the decision to locate this facility should be subject to a thorough assessment and approval process. It should not be approved as part of this EIS as there is simply no detail provided about the impact of this facility on the amenity of the area.
5. **Removal of vegetation – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site. There are several mature trees located on the north of the site. None of these trees should be removed as they provide precious greenery. They also act as a visual and noise screen for residents from the City West Link traffic. All efforts should be taken to retain the trees and the EIS should not simply permit these trees to be removed without proper investigations being undertaken as to how they can be retained. If they are removed 9followign a proper investigation and consideration of all options) then the approval needs to specify that all streets are replaced with mature, native trees at the conclusion of the construction at the site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: ALAN TEMELKOV Address: 137/69 ALLEN ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my,personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Construction hours – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that works affecting parts of the surface road network 'subject to high traffic volumes' will occur out of hours. As Darley Road falls into this category it is likely residents will be subjected to regular out of hours works. This is an unacceptable impact given the EIS provides for 10 weeks of surface works. Any approval conditions need to place a reasonable and enforceable limit on the number of nights of out of hours work.
2. **EIS is 'indicative only'** The EIS states that the EIS is indicative only and can be subject to change by the contractor. In addition, the community will have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs, nor on the preferred Infrastructure Report. The EIS should not be approved as it does not give the community a meaningful opportunity to comment on the impacts to which it will be subject to as a result of this project.
3. **Lack of information** The EIS sets out the 'consultation' which has occurred with the community over the past 12 months. However, these consultation sessions have not provided any meaningful information. And in the EIS no detail is provided as to how impacts will be managed. For example, the traffic will be subject to a traffic management plan. What is traffic cannot be managed to an acceptable level at Darley Road? The EIS does not provide any assurance that impacts such as congestion caused by the addition of 170 vehicle movements a day at the Darley Road site, will be managed to an acceptable level.
4. **Blackmore oval.** The EIS states that Blackmore Oval was not taken for this project as a result of feedback from the community. I understand that the site was unsuitable for tunneling as it suffered from flooding and was ruled out on this basis. The EIS should not contain misrepresentations such as this.
5. **Flooding – Leichhardt.** Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.
6. **Leichhardt North Light Rail** – The presence of hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery at the Darley Road site will make it difficult and hazardous for pedestrians to access the light rail. There is no detail in the EIS as to how this impact will be managed and the EIS should not be approved without properly identifying management strategies for this risk.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: J. PRIEST Address: 2 STARLING ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Traffic diversions – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents. Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.
2. **Permanent water treatment plant and substation – Leichhardt** The proposal to locate this permanent structure in a residential setting is opposed. The site will have a negative visual impact on the area and is in direct line of sight of a number of homes. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site further from homes.
3. **Discharge of water into storm water at Blackmore Oval – Leichhardt** The permanent substation and water treatment plant proposed for the Darley Road site facility should not be approved as part of the EIS. It proposes discharging water from the tunnels into the storm water canal near Blackmore Oval. This will devastate our waterways and impact negatively on the amenity of the bay which has four rowing clubs in close proximity. In addition, the environmental impacts of this discharge are not properly set out in the EIS.
4. **Impacts not provided – Permanent water treatment plant and substation** – The EIS states that there will be an office, worker parking and buildings to accommodate this facility on a permanent basis. It does not provide any detail as to – noise impacts, numbers of workers on site, any health risks associated with the facility. This is simply inadequate and the decision to locate this facility should be subject to a thorough assessment and approval process. It should not be approved as part of this EIS as there is simply no detail provided about the impact of this facility on the amenity of the area.
5. **Removal of vegetation – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site. There are several mature trees located on the north of the site. None of these trees should be removed as they provide precious greenery. They also act as a visual and noise screen for residents from the City West Link traffic. All efforts should be taken to retain the trees and the EIS should not simply permit these trees to be removed without proper investigations being undertaken as to how they can be retained. If they are removed 9followign a proper investigation and consideration of all options) then the approval needs to specify that all streets are replaced with mature, native trees at the conclusion of the construction at the site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile_____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: J PRIEST
	Address: 2 STARLING ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **No need for 'dive' site – Leichhardt.** There is no need for the Darley Road site, other than a time saving (tunneling) of several months. It is unacceptable that the community should be forced to endure 5 years of severe disruption to accommodate the timetable of the private contractors. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it contains provision for the Darley Road site without any proper justification as for its need.
2. **Truck routes – Leichhardt:** No trucks should be permitted on Darley Road or local roads in Leichhardt or Lilyfield. The EIS proposes that all trucks will arrive at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site from Haberfield and travel along Darley Road to the site, with a right-hand turn now permitted into James Street. The proposed route will result in a truck every 3-4 minutes for 5 years running directly by the small houses on Darley Road. These homes will not be habitable during the five-year construction period due to the unacceptable noise impacts. The truck noise will be worsened by their need to travel up a steep hill to return to the City West Link, so the noise impacts will affect not just those homes on or immediately adjacent to Darley Road. The proposal to run trucks so close to homes is dangerous and there have been two fatalities on Darley Road at the proposed site location. The EIS does not propose any noise or safety barriers to address this. Despite the unacceptable impact to nearby homes, there is no proposal for noise walls, nor any mitigation to individual homes.
3. **Alternative access route for trucks – Leichhardt:** The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. The plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates.
4. **Vegetation: Leichhardt.** The mature trees on the Darley Road site should be preserved. If any trees are removed during construction it should be a condition of approval that they are replaced with mature trees.
5. **Permanent substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt:** I object to the location of this facility in our neighbourhood as out of step with the surroundings. If it is retained, then it should be moved to the north of the site, out of view from homes. The residual land should be returned for community purposes such as parkland.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: J PRIEST Address: 2 STANLEY ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Construction hours – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that works affecting parts of the surface road network 'subject to high traffic volumes' will occur out of hours. As Darley Road falls into this category it is likely residents will be subjected to regular out of hours works. This is an unacceptable impact given the EIS provides for 10 weeks of surface works. Any approval conditions need to place a reasonable and enforceable limit on the number of nights of out of hours work.
2. **EIS is 'indicative only'** The EIS states that the EIS is indicative only and can be subject to change by the contractor. In addition, the community will have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs, nor on the preferred Infrastructure Report. The EIS should not be approved as it does not give the community a meaningful opportunity to comment on the impacts to which it will be subject to as a result of this project.
3. **Lack of information** The EIS sets out the 'consultation' which has occurred with the community over the past 12 months. However, these consultation sessions have not provided any meaningful information. And in the EIS no detail is provided as to how impacts will be managed. For example, the traffic will be subject to a traffic management plan. What is traffic cannot be managed to an acceptable level at Darley Road? The EIS does not provide any assurance that impacts such as congestion caused by the addition of 170 vehicle movements a day at the Darley Road site, will be managed to an acceptable level.
4. **Blackmore oval.** The EIS states that Blackmore Oval was not taken for this project as a result of feedback from the community. I understand that the site was unsuitable for tunneling as it suffered from flooding and was ruled out on this basis. The EIS should not contain misrepresentations such as this.
5. **Flooding – Leichhardt.** Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.
6. **Leichhardt North Light Rail** – The presence of hundreds of trucks and heavy machinery at the Darley Road site will make it difficult and hazardous for pedestrians to access the light rail. There is no detail in the EIS as to how this impact will be managed and the EIS should not be approved without properly identifying management strategies for this risk.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: J PRIEST Address: 2 STARLING ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Leichhardt Environmental issues - Substation and water treatment plant**
   The EIS proposes that 'treated' water from the tunnel will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. We object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons.
2. **Presence of Substation and water treatment plant - Leichhardt**
   There is no detail in the EIS about the impact of the ongoing Motorway maintenance activities during operation provided (noise, vibrations, hours of operation, workers on site etc). The community therefore cannot comment on the impact that this permanent facility will have on the amenity of the area. The erection of this facility should not be approved in the basis that no information is provided and therefore impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not known.
3. **Out-of-hours and night work - Leichhardt**
   Because Darley Rd is highly congested during day time, it is likely there will be frequent out of hours and night work. The EIS as drafted effectively permits out of hours to be undertaken whenever this is convenient to the contractor. This will create an unacceptable impact on those living close to the site. The approval conditions need to prohibit out of hours and night work except in genuine exceptional circumstances (for example, a risk to life). It is unacceptable to not provide limits and clear rules on such work.
4. **Flooding – Leichhardt**
   The EIS states that there may be impacts from flooding which, amongst other things, may disrupt drainage systems. Darley Road is in a flood zone and there have been ongoing issued with flooding requiring remedial work. This proposal creates an unacceptable risk of flooding and associated damage and a major tunnelling site should not be permitted on this site on this ground. There is no detail as to how the issues with flooding at Darley Road will be managed and on their potential impact on the area.
   Disruption to road network – Leichhardt
5. **Disruption to road network**
   The EIS states that there will be 'impacts' 'that would affect the efficiency of the road network.' No detail is provided in the EIS as to how cars will be able to access and cross the City West Link once 170 vehicles (heavy and light) access the site on a daily basis. it belies common sense how this can even be considered, given its impact on commuter times.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment PO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: J PRIEST Address: 2 STARLING ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Heavy vehicle movements during peak hours – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that 'reasonable and practical management strategies would be investigated to minimize the volume of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours.' (8-53). This is also not acceptable as it is not known what will actually be done to manage this impact. It is not good enough for the EIS, which forms the basis of the approval of this project, to simply mention 'investigations' and not detail a proper plan (on which residents can comment) on management of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours. In addition, Darley Road is very congested from 7am until 9.30am and then from 4pm-6.30pm, well outside the 'peak' periods identified in the EIS. And the impact on traffic will be caused by 'light' vehicles and not simply heavy vehicles. It is clear that there is no plan for managing these vehicle movements. The EIS should not be approved as drafted. It is unacceptable for this volume of vehicles to be proposed for this critical arterial road with no plan for management.
2. **Light construction vehicle routes** – the EIS acknowledges that these vehicles will use 'dispersed' routes (8-62). In other words, construction vehicles will use and park on local roads. The EIS does not propose any management as to which roads they use. The addition of 70-100 light vehicle movements day in Leichhardt will result in our small, congested streets, which are already at capacity and suffering parking shortages, will have the added impact of workers travelling to and from the site and parking in local streets. There will be rat running. The EIS should provide an agreed route (using arterial roads only) that can be used by all vehicles associated with the project.
3. **EIS is Indicative only** - The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.
4. **Intersection of James St and City West Link** – The EIS (8-630 indicates that there will be an increase in traffic volume during construction of nearly 400 vehicles during peak hour. The only strategy to manage this is allowing a right-hand turn into James Street. This intersection is the third most dangerous in the inner west (based on TfNSW's own statistics). There is no analysis of crash statistics at this intersection provided in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved in its current form. It needs to provide certainty to the community that they will be able to reasonable access this part of the road network in a timely and safe manner.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Corine Sullen
	Address: Rozelle
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** **Postcode**
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.
- In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.
- The RMS has previously identified the Darley Rd site in Leichhardt as the third most dangerous traffic hazard in the Inner West. The NSW Land and Environment Court found that the location of the site couldn't safely deal with 60 bottle truck movements a week, but the M4/M5 EIS shows that more than 800 vehicles including hundreds of heavy ones will use the site each day as part of construction of M4M5 Link. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why are the already acknowledged impacts being ignored.
- It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.
- The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.
- EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: SAM WILLIAMS Signature: [signature] *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 6a Woodford St, [redacted] Suburb: Conqueville Postcode 2066	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

I. *The EIS states that Darley Road is a contaminated site, likely including asbestos. There is a risk to the community associated with spoil removal, transfer and handling. We object to the selection of the site based on the environmental risks that this creates, along with risks to health of residents.*

II. *Motor vehicles account for 14% of Particulate Pollution of 2.5 microns and less in Australia. There is no safe level to exposure to particulate matter of 2.5 microns and less. Particulate matter is linked with Asthma, Lung Disease, Cancer and Stroke.*

III. *The warm and caring words contained in the EIS, ref Sustainability Management Strategy, have not been reflected in the wanton destruction of homes, trees and habitat already. Why should we believe them?*

IV. *The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement may occur. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. In addition, the EIS states that there are a number of discrete areas to the north and northwest of the Rozelle Rail Yards, to the north of Campbell Road at St Peters and in the vicinity of Lord Street at Newtown where ground water movement above 20 milliliters is predicted 'strict limits on the degree of settlement permitted would be imposed on the project" and 'damage' would be rectified at no cost to the owner. would be placed (Executive Summary, xvii -iii). The project should not be permitted to be delivered in such a way that there is a known risk to property damage that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level of risk.*

V. *Noise mitigation – Leichhardt. The noise mitigation proposed in the EIS is unacceptable. No detail of noise walls is provided, giving residents no opportunity to comment on whether final impacts are acceptable. This is despite the fact 36 homes are identified in the EIS as severely affected by construction noise. The acoustic shed proposed is of the lowest grade and does not cover the entire site, resulting in noise impacts from the movement of trucks in and out of the tunnel access point. The highest grade acoustic shed should be provided, with the shed covering the entire site. The additional noise mitigation such as noise walls, need to be det out in detail so that residents can properly comment on the impacts.*

VI. *The EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONnex.*

Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment. GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW,2001

Attention Director — Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: KYLIE REYNOLDS

Signature: Kylie Reynolds

Please include/delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
Declaration: I have not made any reportable donations in the last two years.

Address: 438 MALABAR RD

Suburb: MAROUBRA Postcode: 2035

I wish to register my strong objections to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link). My reasons are set out below:

1. REASONS FOR WESTCONNEX

The main reason given for the construction of the WestConnex motorway is to connect to Sydney Airport and Port Botany. The project has failed to meet both of these objectives.

2. TRAVEL TIME SAVED?

If stage 3 of the Westconnex project is completed, it is predicted that by 2033, reductions in peak travel times from Western Sydney to the airport and to the Botany Port area will be **miniscule**. Parramatta to Sydney airport will save **10 minutes**, between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saved will **be 5 minutes** and between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saved will **be 10 minutes.** These are only the best predictions put forward and time savings may in fact be much less. The whole rationale for building this wasteful **18 billion dollar** polluting project was precisely for that reason... to reduce travel times and to connect with Port Botany and the Airport.

3. SUBSIDENCE AND HOUSE DAMAGE

The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur", further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of **ground movement and subsidence is lessened** where tunnelling is more than **35 metres underground**. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned **Inner West Interchange** at Leichhardt, Lilyfield and Annandale proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg **John St at 22m, Hill St at 28m, Moore St 27m (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2), Catherine St at 28m (Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1)**. At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be **no incentive** for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

4. DEPTHS OF TUNNELS AND INCOMPLETE EIS DIAGRAMS

In response to enquiries made to the Westconnex Info line it was confirmed that the depths are measured from the excavation to the surface. Diagrams of the tunnel dimensions in the EIS only give 5.3m as a minimum height. When further clarification was sought of the total height ie from the tunnel floor to the crown (top of the tunnel), Westconnex Infoline confirmed that 5.3m is the 'minimum height', and when pressed further that there is an **extra 2.2m** above this to allow for signage and jet fans, giving a total height of 7.5m.

This is in contrast to information from staff at the Westconnex Information Balmain session who claimed the extra section above the minimum height of 5.3m would be between **1 to 1.5m**.

It throws into confusion what the total height of the tunnels are and therefore the depths of tunnels below homes, which again the Information Session staff stated could be changed by the contractors. What are residents expected to believe? Yet Westconnex is asking residents to provide feedback on inadequate, conflicting information.

Significantly, there is nothing in the EIS to ensure that tunnelling would be at a sufficient depth so as not to endanger the integrity of homes, including vibration, and noise impacts.

Recent experience tells us that residents in the ongoing construction of Stages 1 and 2 have suffered extensive damage to their homes caused by vibration, tunnelling activities, and changed soil moisture content costing thousands of dollars to rectify, with their claims still not settled. Insurance policies will not cover this type of damage. The onus has been on residents to prove that damage to their homes was caused by Westconnex. Furthermore, the EIS actually concedes there will be moisture drawdown caused by tunnelling. There is nothing addressing these major concerns in the EIS. This is what residents living in the path of WestConnex are facing and it is totally unacceptable.

In view of the above no tunnelling less than 35m in depth from the surface to the crown of a tunnel (ie the top) under residences should be undertaken. And of course no tunnelling should be undertaken under sensitive sites.

5. HEALTH DANGERS

It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle, Leichhardt and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With massive number of extra truck **four unfiltered emissions stacks** in the area plus a **large number of exit portals,** the residents of this area will suffer greatly from **poisonous diesel particulates.** This is negligent when you consider that, the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared **diesel particulates carcinogenic.** " As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."

6. AIR AND NOISE POLLUTION

Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience **increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution**— most particularly at The Crescent, Johnson St Annandale and Catherine St Leichhardt and Ross Street Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a **massive number of extra truck movements** and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times. Also, the widening of The Crescent between the city West Link and Johnston Street with **an extra lane being constructed** will lead to heavy traffic congestion on a road that has **3 Primary/Infants schools.**

Furthermore, the EIS states that the current Rozelle Interchange and surrounds of Anzac Bridge are presently close to full capacity. In fact, Anzac Bridge is **currently at maximum** capacity during peak hours. With the proposed construction, the area is going to be subjected to a huge increase in vehicle movements throughout the 5 year construction period.

7. TRUCK MOVEMENTS

The removal of spoil from the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to **the largest number of spoil truck movements** on the entire Stage 3 project: **517 Heavy truck movements a day,** of which 46 are stated to take place during peak hours. This will lead to extra noise and air pollution in this area.

The **unacceptable noise levels** which will accompany the construction of this massive interchange will further add to the discomfort of the residents. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution which will adversely affect residents. The EIS actually states that local residents may have to keep their windows and doors closed to keep out the noise and dust. The proposed work hours for construction in the Goods Yard for the tunneling and spoil removal are 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This could lead to loss of sleep for local residents as well as loss of lifestyle.

There will also be disturbance of soil in the old Rozelle Goods Yard which may be thick with toxic contaminants such as **lead and asbestos** (as was the case in St Peters.) You made no provision for the safe removal of these toxic substances in St Peters and I do not see any provision in the EIS for their safe removal in this area.

8. LOSS OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

The removal of Buruwan Park between The Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Parade, Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a direct loss of much-needed parkland in this Inner City area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a **major cycle route** from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, IJTS and the CBD.

9. PROPOSED PARK

The proposed building of a park in the area of the Goods Yard right in the middle of a large number of exit portals and **poisonous smoke stacks** borders on being criminally negligent. This new **'recreational area' will** be subject to the dangerous invisible particulates of 2.5 microns and smaller so many residents and children will be unaware that they are being poisoned. **All evidence shows that these particulates are linked with increased cases of asthma, lung disease, cancer and stroke** placing further pressure on our already overloaded health system.

10. RESIDENT CONSULTATION

Although the EIS indicates what is to be expected when construction begins, it also states that that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed upon. This may result in major **changes to the project design and construction methodologies.** The community would have **no say in this process!**

11. CHANGE OF PLANS?

In the introduction of the EIS it clearly states that the information in the EIS is 'indicative of the final design' only. The reality of this statement means that the project may be completely different to stated plans in the EIS and **shows the process is a sham.**

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: LAURA PARAGA Signature: Parag *Please **include / delete (cross out or circle)** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 23 RENWICK ST., UNIT 3, 2016 REDFERN Suburb: REDFERN Postcode: 2016	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

1. Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex and the government is seeking approval, yet there are no detailed construction plans so we are not speaking to a real situation.
2. The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.
3. The business case for the project in all three stages has failed to taken into account the external costs of these massive road projects in air pollution for human and environmental health, in adding fossil fuel emissions to increase global warming effects, and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities, of displacement of people and businesses and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh any benefits from building roads which poorly serve people's transport needs but instead enrich private corporations.
4. This EIS contains **no meaningful** design and construction details and no parameters as to how broad changes and therefore impacts could be. It therefore fails to allow the community to be informed about and comment on the project impacts in a meaningful way.
5. The EIS at 7-41 acknowledges that there is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will be made a 24 hour clearway, stating "Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street". This statement is deliberately misleading - it infers that SMC has authority in controlling impacts on regional roads. Roads and Maritime have the unfettered right to declare Clearways wherever and whenever they wish, and RMS has **NEVER** stated publicly that King Street will not be subject to extended clearways.
6. The EIS at 12-57 describes possible disruptions of water supply to a vast area of Sydney as a result of tunnelling in the proximity of two major Sydney Water Tunnels in the Newtown area, stating "*Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water Assets*". Why has an EIS been published that infers that the tunnel alignments have been thoroughly surveyed and researched, when further survey work could dramatically alter the alignments in the future ?
7. There are estimated 100 heavy and 70 light vehicle movements a day and the plan is to allow a right-hand turn into Darley Road from the CW Link. The trucks will drive onto Darley Road, turn right into the site and then left back out onto the CW Link, which is unrealistic given the amount of traffic on these roads now.
8. I am appalled that the Sydney Motorway Corporation could seek approval to build complex interchanges under the suburbs of Rozelle and Leichhardt on the basis of an EIS that is based on a concept design rather than detailed proposal that includes engineering plans.
9. The warm and caring words contained in the EIS, ref Sustainability Management Strategy, have not been reflected in the wanton destruction of homes, trees and habitat already. Why should we believe them?
10. The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters Interchange will have a heavy disruptive impact on the local transport routes, whether by vehicle, bus, or active transport (walking and cycling)

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: MR BRENTH GARNSEY Signature: *Please include / exclude (circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 38 GRANT ST Suburb: TEMPE Postcode 2044	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

Constant out of hours work expected and permitted – Leichhardt:

a) The EIS states that 'some surface works' would need to be carried out out-of-hours to minimise traffic disruptions or for safety or operational reasons'. Given that Darley Road is a known accident black spot and is highly congested, particularly at peak periods, it is likely that there will be frequent out-of-hours work. This will create an unacceptable impact on those living close to the site. There are an estimated 36 homes that will suffer severe noise impacts and out of hours work will adversely affect their amenity of life. In addition, it is likely to lead to additional road closures and diversions, placing pressure on the local traffic network. No out-of-hours work should be permitted except in the case of a true emergency. The EIS as drafted effectively permits out of hours to be undertaken whenever this is convenient to the contractor (Executive Summary xiv).

Unacceptable construction noise levels – Leichhardt:

b) The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. Activities identified include earthworks, demolition of existing structures and site establishment and utility adjustments. The Darley Road site will suffer unacceptable construction impacts due to the need to demolish the large Dan Murphy's building and the EIS notes that 10 weeks of demolition and road adjustment works will be needed. There are no additional mitigation measures proposed for residents during this period such as temporary relocation, noise walls or treatments for individual homes. The approval needs to contain detail as to how this unacceptable impact will be managed and minimised during the construction period and, in particular, during site establishment. (Executive Summary, xiv) We object to the selection of this site on the basis that the works required (demolition and surface works) will create unbearable noise and vibration impacts and make over 30 homes unlivable and there are NO additional mitigation plans for these residents.

Risk of settlement (ground movement) – Leichhardt:

c) The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment). The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, it is proposed to tunnel at 29 metres under hawthorne Parade Haberfield and only 35 metres at Elswick Street North. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. (Executive Summary, xvii). The EIS states that damage will be rectified at no cost to residents with no detail as to how this will occur or the likely extent of property damage. The project should not be approved on the basis that it creates a risk of property damage that cannot be mitigated against so as to bring the risk to an acceptable level.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Robyn McDonald

Signature: RMcDonald

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
***Declaration** : I*

Address: 199 Trafalgar Street

Suburb: Annandale Postcode 2038

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements of project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.

☐ There are overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 of up to one year. This will significantly worsen impacts for residents close to construction areas. No additional mitigation or any compensation is offered for residents for these periods.(Executive Summary xxvii). It is unacceptable that residents should have these prolonged periods of exposure to more than one project. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure.

- The EIS states that there may be a 'small increase in pollutant concentrations' near surface roads.The EIS states that potential health impacts associated with changes in air quality (specifically nitrogen dioxide and particulates) within the local community have been assessed and are considered to be 'acceptable.' We disagree that the impacts on human health are acceptable and object to the project in its entirety because of these impacts. (Executive Summary xvi)

☐ The EIS is misleading because it discusses the creation of 14,350 direct jobs during construction. It omits the fact that jobs have also been lost because of acquisition of businesses, many of which were long-standing and employed hundreds of workers. (Executive Summary xviii)

☐ No noise barriers have been proposed. This is unacceptable and appropriate noise barriers should be included in the EIS for consideration. (Executive Summary xvii)

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Name: Milena Romanin
Address: 4/23 Clarendon Rd
Application Number: SSI 7485
Suburb: Stanmore NSW Postcode 2048
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Signature: Milena Romanin

Please **include / delete (cross out or circle)** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS M4/M5 Application, for the following reasons:

1. I strongly object to the **unknown hazard** associated with two different tunnelling operations taking place in close proximity in time and location - the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link and the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown. The impact of this combined tunnelling is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the residences and buildings above, many of them very old and heritage listed. This is a serious community safety issue and residents who experience damage will be caught between 2 separate contractors for repairs and compensation.
2. I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the deadline for submission of comments on the concept design. The formal response to the 1000s of comments and submissions on the design, released only after the EIS, cannot possibly be based on a full assessment and consideration of the community responses. This is an insult to the community and questions the integrity of the entire EIS process.
3. The decision to build a three-stage tollway of the scale and complexity proposed and that has never been built before is risking community safety and state resources. I strongly object to that fact that this risk has never been subjected to democratic decision-making and in fact has been opposed by the great majority of submissions received in response to the Environmental Impact Statements for the first two stages.
4. The original objectives of WestConnex was to improve road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany with the Interchange now being built at St Peters located much closer to the airport. This contradicts the stated purpose of the extension of the M4. Now both the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1000s more cars per day onto the roads to the airport which are already over-crowded and competing with freight transport. I strongly object to the impact of the M4/M5 link as it fails to meet the original purpose and provide a sustainable rail link to enable freight to be moved out of the city and commuters to travel by public transport.
5. Across all 3 stages the business case has not taken into account the external costs of these massive road projects in air pollution for human and environmental health, in adding fossil fuel emissions to increase global warming effects, and in the economic and social costs of the disruption to human activities, of displacement of people and businesses and of the destruction of community cohesion and amenity. These external costs far outweigh any benefits from building roads which poorly serve people's transport needs but instead enrich private corporations.
6. The high cost of the tolls has already resulted in an increase in traffic on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. Their anticipated annual increase will likely mean that more and more commuters will seek to avoid the expensive tolls. It makes sense to expect the same effect on the roads around the St Peters Interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware Rd and Enmore Rd and though the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria. The increasing numbers of vehicles will mean more vehicle pollution in the area (known to have adverse effects on breathing and also to be carcinogenic). A viable public train system would easily and effectively manage commuter traffic without the requirement for expensive private tollways.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____; Email: _____; Mobile: _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Anna Keohan Address: 43 Victoria Rd
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Marrickville Postcode 2204
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

Please **include / delete (cross out or circle)** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS M4/M5 application, for the following reasons:

1. The EIS at 7-21 states that Community Update Newsletters were distributed to residents 'near the project footprint' in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses 'letterboxed'. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.
2. The EIS at 7-25 refers to 876 comments (limited to 140 characters) made via the collaborative map on the Concept Design 'up to July' that were considered in the preparation of the EIS. It does not mention the many hundreds of extended written submissions that were lodged in late July and early August. These critical 'community engagement' feedback submissions have clearly not been considered in the preparation of the EIS. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
3. The EIS at 7-51 refers to concerns that were raised by the community that the alignment of tunnels in Newtown appeared to go to the east of King Street, an area that had had no geotech drilling or testing. SMC staff indicated at Community information sessions that the maps included in the Concept Design were broad and indicative only, and that further details would be available in the EIS. No further details have been provided. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
4. The EIS at 7-41 acknowledges that there is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will be made a 24-hour clearway, stating "Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street". This statement is deliberately misleading, inferring SMC has authority over regional roads. Roads and Maritime have the unfettered right to declare Clearways wherever/whenever and RMS has **NEVER** stated publicly that King St will not be subject to clearways.
5. SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
6. EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. *"The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in **Chapter 1**, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval".* The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.
7. The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.

I call on the Minister for Planning to reject this project and demand that the government re-think the transport planning for the whole metropolitan area taking into account long term sustainability over short-term private profit.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name: _____: Email:_____: Mobile _____

Submission to: Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW 2001 Attention: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: Gail Kennedy Signature: G Kennedy *Please **include / delete (cross out or circle)** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.* ***Declaration:** I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the late 2 years.* Address: 34 White St Suburb: Lilyfield Postcode: 2040

I am registering my strong objections to Stage 3 of Westconnex, the M4-M5 link for the following reasons:

23-9-17

1.SMC have made it extremely difficult for the community to access hard copies of the EIS. The local Glebe library only has one copy and this is the situation at other local libraries. There are very limited hours of access to these locations outside normal working hours. Access to the EIS is very difficult without access to a personal computer. This totally restricts open community engagement.

2.The EIS gives no information about changes to traffic increases entering the Sydney CBD caused by the Westconnex. Duncan Gay when asked about this, in connection to huge increases of traffic predicted to enter the city from Westconnex at St Peters, would only say that traffic would disperse! So thousands of extra vehicles would magically disperse – where? There is no plan for this. RMS has only just started work to identify which roads will need to be upgraded to deal with these vast numbers of extra vehicles entering the city. So it is impossible to form an understanding of the true Environmental impacts of this project – which is the very purpose of an EIS.

3.The Westconnex has been described as an integrated transport network solution. This is totally untrue as the role and integration with public transport and freight rail has not been assessed. The Government recently committed to a Metro West so this throws into question the need for Westconnex. This is especially so as the Westconnex business case outlines a shift from public transport to toll roads as a benefit. This needs to be justified economically. The EIS does not do this.

4. At the Rozelle Rail Yards site there will be 2 entry/exits for Heavy vehicles off the City West Link. Extra traffic controls are to be set up with extra sequences of traffic light controls to enable spoil trucks to access and exit this site. It is stated there will be 517 Heavy Truck movements as day of which 46 will be in Peak hours, plus 10 truck movements from the Crescent site. Maps showing the truck movements show that all these trucks will use the City West link. Similar maps for Darley Rd dive site also show trucks from there using the City West Link. At a consultation with a Westconnex staff member it was stated that trucks removing spoil from Camperdown dive site would be stationed and called up from James Craig Rd, so there will also be a constant movement of trucks from this location onto the City West Link. The EIS states the cumulative effect of truck movements from all sites onto the City West Link will be 700 one way Heavy truck movements a day and of that 208 will be in Peak hours. This will cause total gridlock. The EIS says other routes maybe considered; there are no details of these. This is unacceptable as it would allow a privately owned SMC to make whatever decisions they saw fit when and if the EIS is approved with no input from the community allowed.

5.The removal of Buruwan Park for road widening and the realignment of the Crescent is a particular loss of badly needed parkland. This park was established as a nature corridor and a buffer to shield the local residents from City West Link, there are mature trees on this site, it was not intended as a children's recreational area with play equipment, the description in the EIS is inaccurate. Buruwan Park also has a main cycle route running through it. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no account of encouraging cycling as a mode of transport. The alternative routes are based on distance only and take no account of time taken or topography. Had this been done then this would have changed the assessment for the removal of the existing cycle/walkway bridge over the City West link. There is also no mention of this bridge being replaced after construction of the Westconnex. This is not acceptable.

Submission to: Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW 2001 Attention: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: Gael Kennedy Signature: G Kennedy *Please **include / delete (cross out or circle)** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.* ***Declaration:** I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the late 2 years.* Address: 34 White St Suburb: Lilyfield Postcode: 2040

After studying the massive EIS document I wish to register my strong objections to this entire project for numerous reasons.

23 – 9 – 17

1. The EIS was released just 12 days after the closing date for submissions to the Concept Design. This proves the Concept Design and the submissions were a sham. There were hundreds of posts on the interactive map and there were over thousand written submissions. There is no way these submissions could have been read, evaluated, their points integrated, and the 7500 page EIS edited, printed, checked and distributed in 12 days. The EIS was obviously prepared prior to the closing of submission to the Concept Design. This is a total abuse of the NSW Planning Laws.

2.The original stated objective of Westconnex had as its fundamental objective the connecting to Port Botany. The original objective was the improvement of freight access to the Airport and Port Botany. Stage 1, 2 and 3 do not achieve this goal and this is not addressed in the EIS.

3.It is stated that the hugely expensive Stage 3 M4/M5 link is required as a link between the two motorways. This is totally untrue. The A3 is the primary eastern link between the two motorways and it is described in the State Road network system as the M4- M5 Connector.

4.The introduction of the EIS clearly states that the information in the EIS is " indicative" of the final design only. The reality of this statement means that the project may be completely different to stated plans in the EIS. Furthermore although the EIS indicates what is to be expected when construction begins, it also states that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed upon. This may result in major changes to the project design and construction methodologies. The community would have no say in this process.

5.The most highly effected area of Stage 3 will be Rozelle with the massive and complex interchange. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World and it is highly questionable as to whether it can be built at all in the form outlined in the EIS. The EIS does not show any detailed plans as to how this will be achieved. There are no constructional details at all, what is shown is a concept only, this is totally unacceptable.

6.Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for site workers(EIS). The daily workforce for these sites is shown to be approximately 550. This means that 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already at full capacity during weekdays from commuters parking and taking the light rail.

7.There will be 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place during peak hours from the Rozelle Rail Yard the largest amount of spoil truck movement on the whole of Stage 3. This will lead to a vast amount of extra noise and air pollution in this area. There will also be disturbance of soil in the old Rozelle Goods Yard which will be heavily contaminated with toxic substances. It is highly probable that there will be lead and asbestos. (as was the case in St Peters) You made no provision for the safe removal of these toxic substances in St Peters and the EIS makes no provision for their safe removal in this area.

8.The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur. It states that subsidence may occur along tunnel paths due to tunnel excavation and water drawdown. The risk of ground movement and subsidence is greater where tunnels are less than 35 metres underground. The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels in that area which are a great deal less than 35metres. The same is true for areas of Rozelle where layers of tunnels are proposed. This will definitely lead to structural damage and cracking to homes above. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage. This is not acceptable

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: J PRICE Address: 2 STRAND ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Traffic operational modelling – Leichhardt.** The EIS does not provide any operational modelling for the Darley Road area (8-11), despite the fact 170 vehicles a day are proposed to enter this highly congested (during peak hours) area. Darley Road is a critical arterial road for commuters accessing the City West Link and this analysis should be provided so that impacts can be properly assessed.
2. **Crash statistics** – City West Link and James St intersection. The EIS only analyses crash statistics near the interchanges. It does not provide any detail as to the number of crashes at the James St/City West Link intersection which, on Transport for NSW's own figures, is the third most dangerous intersection in the inner west. Nor does it comment on the two fatalities that occurred on Darley Road near the proposed construction site. The EIS needs to detail the increased risk in crashes that will be caused by the additional 170 vehicles a day that are proposed to enter and leave Darley Road during the construction period. The EIS needs to detail how this risk of crashes will be managed to an acceptable level, which it does not.
3. **Worker parking** – Leichhardt. There is provision in the EIS for only a dozen worker car parks and no provision for the 100 or so workers who will be permanently based at the Darley Road site for up to five years. A major construction site project should not be permitted in a neighbourhood area without allocated parking for **all** workers. No other business would be permitted to be established without this requirement being satisfied – why is it acceptable for this project? In addition, the EIS proposes the removal of 20 car spaces used by residents on Darley Road and will remove the 'kiss and ride' facility at the light rail stop. This will result in residents being unable to park in their own street and will increase noise impacts from workers doing shift changeovers 24 hours a day. The EIS needs to mandate the use of public transport or provide for workers to be bussed in if adequate allocated parking is not provided.
4. **Number of vehicle movements** – Leichhardt. The EIS states that there will be 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day during construction (5 years). There is no guarantee that these figures are accurate as they are indicative only. The effect of these movements will be drastically increased commuter times for anyone accessing the City West Link during peak periods. The Darley Road site is equally busy on Saturday and this is not accounted for or acknowledged in the EIS. The EIS should not permit this number of vehicle movements and should be rejected on this basis as there is no plan as to how this will be managed. Referring to a future traffic management plan is inadequate – there is no guarantee that any such plan will be able to manage this traffic impact to an acceptable level.
5. **Access routes** – Leichhardt. The EIS states that all construction vehicles will enter and leave via Darley Road. Although near the City West Link, Darley Rd abuts a large number of small, local streets and homes and streets near Darley Road will be impacted by a heavy vehicle movement every 3-4 minutes. This is an unacceptable impact. No heavy or light vehicle movements should be permitted on Darley Road whatsoever and an alternative route which does not involve Darley Road is the only route that should be approved.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: LINDA SETTZ
	Address: 91 FRANCIS ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Linda Settz
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. I object to the planned acquisition of the Dan Murphys site on Darley Road for the creation of a civil and tunnel works site.
2. The Darley Road site has many issues which make tunneling at this point an unacceptable risk, including that it is in a flood zone. This proposal will worsen the existing flooding risk. The mitigation suggested in the EIS is not adequate.
3. The EIS states that property damage will occur due to ground movement may occur. The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres.
4. The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This approach deprives residents of any ability to comment on the detailed designs. (Executive Summary xvi)
5. The EIS does not mention the impact of aircraft noise and its cumulative impact. Therefore, noise levels identified in the EIS are misleading. The EIS states there will be at least 10 weeks of severe noise impacts during the time that Dan Murphys is demolished and the road prepared. I object to the selection of the Darley Road site because of the unacceptable noise impacts it will have on surrounding homes and businesses, with at least 36 homes identified as suffering extreme noise interference for this initial 10-week period.
6. The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site which includes several mature trees. I object to the removal of these trees which create a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the trees are removed they must be replaced with mature trees as soon as the remediation of the site commences.
7. There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be safe. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.
8. The proposal for a permanent water treatment plant and substation to the south of the site on Darley Road will prevent direct pedestrian access to the light rail station. It will affect the future uses of the site once the project is completed. The facility is out of step with the area which is comprised of low rise homes and detracts from the visual amenity of the area. This site is a pedestrian hub and will be a visual blight for pedestrians, bike users and the homes that have direct line of sight to the facility. It should not be permitted to be located on this site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: HETAL RATHOD Address: 42 KENSINGTON RD
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: SUMMER HILL Postcode 2130
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Acquisition and demolition of Dan Murphys** – I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the tax payer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances. It is also wasteful that several million dollars was spent on renovations, for the entire structure to de demolished less than 18 months later.
2. **Night works – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that to minimize disruptions to traffic on the existing road network (including in peak hours) there will be night works where appropriate. Given the congested nature of Darley Road, it is likely there will be frequent night work (EIS, 6.4). This will create an unacceptable impact in residents. It is unacceptable that a highly unsuitable site has been selected. And, instead of a proper plan to manage traffic, the EIS contemplate work simply occurring at night. This is objected to in the strongest terms.
3. **Additional facilities.** The EIS states that the contractor may decide upon additional 'construction ancillary facilities' to the 12 identified in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be more unidentified sites taken, as residents will have no opportunity to comment on their impacts. The approval condition should limit any construction facilities to those already notified and detailed in the EIS.
4. **Permanent substation and water treatment plant** - Residents on Darley Rd opposite the site and residents in Hubert St will have a direct line of site to the Motorway operation infrastructure. The resultant impact is a permanent degradation of the visual environment, is a loss of amenity and is detrimental to the community. This facility should not be permitted in this location and the EIS needs to demonstrate why it is required at this site. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site out of line of site of residents. The residual land should be returned for community purposes, such as green space, with future commercial uses ruled out. If the community is forced to endure 5 years of severe disruptions due to this toll road, the compensation should, at the very least, result in the land being returned to the community as green space.
5. **Noise mitigation – Leichhardt.** The noise mitigation proposed in the EIS is unacceptable. No detail of noise walls is provided, giving residents no opportunity to comment on whether final impacts are acceptable. This is despite the fact 36 homes are identified in the EIS as severely affected by construction noise. The acoustic shed proposed is of the lowest grade and does not cover the entire site, resulting in noise impacts from the movement of trucks in and out of the tunnel access point. The highest grade acoustic shed should be provided, with the shed covering the entire site. The additional noise mitigation such as noise walls, need to be set out in detail so that residents can properly comment on the impacts.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: HETAL RATHOD Address: 421 Kensington Rd
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Summer Hill Postcode 2130
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: HRathod
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **Traffic diversions – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that 'temporary diversions along Darley Road may be required during construction' (8-65). No detail is provided as to when these diversions would occur; there is no provision for consultation with the community; no detail as to how long the diversions will be in place and no comment on the impact of diversions on local roads or the amenity of residents. Will diversions occur at night? If so, down what streets? Diverting the arterial traffic from Darley Road down local streets (which are not designed for heavy vehicle volumes) will result in damage to streets, sleep disturbances for residents and create safety issues. There is also childcare centre and a school near the William Street/Elswick Street intersection which will be impacted by diverting vehicles onto local roads. It is unacceptable for proposed road diversions not to be detailed whatsoever in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved without setting out the impacts of road diversions on residents and businesses.
2. **Permanent water treatment plant and substation – Leichhardt** The proposal to locate this permanent structure in a residential setting is opposed. The site will have a negative visual impact on the area and is in direct line of sight of a number of homes. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site further from homes.
3. **Discharge of water into storm water at Blackmore Oval – Leichhardt** The permanent substation and water treatment plant proposed for the Darley Road site facility should not be approved as part of the EIS. It proposes discharging water from the tunnels into the storm water canal near Blackmore Oval. This will devastate our waterways and impact negatively on the amenity of the bay which has four rowing clubs in close proximity. In addition, the environmental impacts of this discharge are not properly set out in the EIS.
4. **Impacts not provided – Permanent water treatment plant and substation –** The EIS states that there will be an office, worker parking and buildings to accommodate this facility on a permanent basis. It does not provide any detail as to – noise impacts, numbers of workers on site, any health risks associated with the facility. This is simply inadequate and the decision to locate this facility should be subject to a thorough assessment and approval process. It should not be approved as part of this EIS as there is simply no detail provided about the impact of this facility on the amenity of the area.
5. **Removal of vegetation – Leichhardt.** The EIS states that all vegetation will be removed on the Darley Road site. There are several mature trees located on the north of the site. None of these trees should be removed as they provide precious greenery. They also act as a visual and noise screen for residents from the City West Link traffic. All efforts should be taken to retain the trees and the EIS should not simply permit these trees to be removed without proper investigations being undertaken as to how they can be retained. If they are removed 9followign a proper investigation and consideration of all options) then the approval needs to specify that all streets are replaced with mature, native trees at the conclusion of the construction at the site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: HETH RATHOD Address: 42/ KENSINGTON RD
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: SUMMER HILL Postcode 2130
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: H Rathod
Please **INCLUDE** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. **No need for 'dive' site – Leichhardt.** There is no need for the Darley Road site, other than a time saving (tunneling) of several months. It is unacceptable that the community should be forced to endure 5 years of severe disruption to accommodate the timetable of the private contractors. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it contains provision for the Darley Road site without any proper justification as for its need.
2. **Truck routes – Leichhardt:** No trucks should be permitted on Darley Road or local roads in Leichhardt or Lilyfield. The EIS proposes that all trucks will arrive at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site from Haberfield and travel along Darley Road to the site, with a right-hand turn now permitted into James Street. The proposed route will result in a truck every 3-4 minutes for 5 years running directly by the small houses on Darley Road. These homes will not be habitable during the five-year construction period due to the unacceptable noise impacts. The truck noise will be worsened by their need to travel up a steep hill to return to the City West Link, so the noise impacts will affect not just those homes on or immediately adjacent to Darley Road. The proposal to run trucks so close to homes is dangerous and there have been two fatalities on Darley Road at the proposed site location. The EIS does not propose any noise or safety barriers to address this. Despite the unacceptable impact to nearby homes, there is no proposal for noise walls, nor any mitigation to individual homes.
3. **Alternative access route for trucks – Leichhardt:** The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. The plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates.
4. **Vegetation: Leichhardt.** The mature trees on the Darley Road site should be preserved. If any trees are removed during construction it should be a condition of approval that they are replaced with mature trees.
5. **Permanent substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt:** I object to the location of this facility in our neighbourhood as out of step with the surroundings. If it is retained, then it should be moved to the north of the site, out of view from homes. The residual land should be returned for community purposes such as parkland.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Lawrence Kaus

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 6 Alice St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The TfNSW website says "The Sydney Metro West project is Sydney's next big railway infrastructure investment" but the Cumulative Impact assessment by AECOM (App C) does not include West Metro. A business case for West Metro should be completed before determination of the Project.

- The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

- Emissions were not modelled beyond 2033. This is an omission, as the contractual life of the project is significantly longer, until 2060. The EIS states, on page 22-15 that 'it is expected that savings in emissions from improved road performance would reduce over time as traffic volumes increase'. Therefore, the longer-term outcome of the project is likely to be an increase in GHG emissions

- Bridge Road School - Pyrmont Bridge Road site - The EIS states that 'construction activities are predicted to impact' this School. However, the only mitigation proposed is to consult with the School 'to identify sensitive receivers of the school along with periods of examination'. (Table 5-120) The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not propose any measures to reduce the impacts to this School. The EIS simply states that 'where practicable' work should be scheduled to avoid major student examination period when students are studying for examinations such as the Higher School Certificate. This is inadequate and students will be studying every day in preparation for examinations and this proposal will impact on their ability to be provided with an education. Consultation is not considered an adequate response and detailed mitigation should be provided which will reduce the impacts to students to an acceptable level.

- Improving connectivity with public transport, including trains, light rail and bus services in the inner west would make the Parramatta Road corridor a more attractive place to live, work and socialise.

- Increased traffic on local roads will decrease residential amenity and decrease the potential for new higher density housing. This will affect numerous streets, with particularly major impacts on The Crescent, Minogue Crescent, Ross, Mount Vernon, Catherine, Ross and Arundel streets in Glebe; and Euston Road, McEvoy, Botany, Wyndham, Bourke and Lachlan Streets in the Green Square area. In the redevelopment areas, land adjoining these streets may suffer a loss of development potential, a loss of value and will bear the additional costs of designing for noisy environments.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: ANGIE CAVE
	Address: 37 IREDALE ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents.NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Greg Ellis

Signature: G Ellis

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 13 Phillips st

Suburb: Newcastle *Postcode* 2292

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the reasons stated below, and request the Minister reject the application entirely, and cause the proponents to reissue an EIS that is based on a fully researched, developed, and budgeted concept design, and require the proponents to prepare a new business case against that design.

(1) The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.

(2) Additional facilities. The EIS states that the contractor may decide upon additional 'construction ancillary facilities' to the 12 identified in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be more unidentified sites taken, as residents will have no opportunity to comment on their impacts. The approval condition should limit any construction facilities to those already notified and detailed in the EIS.

(3) The EIS at 7-21 states that Community update Newsletters were distributed to residents 'near the project footprint' in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses 'letterboxed'. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.

(4) The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

(5) It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle

(6) It is stated that if congestion proves to be a problem then other solutions will have to be found. Other routes that are being considered will be using the Western Distributor, the Crescent, Victoria Rd, Ross St, Pyrmont Bridge Rd and Johnston St. The Crescent and Johnston St are clearly going to be used. This despite the fact that in a consultation those representing Westconnex assured residents of Annandale that neither Johnston St or Booth St would be used. It is expected that these routes will also be used for night transport. It is clear that it is unlikely that transportation routes shown in the EIS will be adhered to. This is unacceptable.

(7) The EIS states that traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange is expected to be worse after completion of the M5 and the M4-M5 Link particularly in the evening peak hour. The EIS admits that this will have a "moderate negative" impact on the neighbourhood in increasing pollution (also admitted separately) therefore in health impacts, on safety for foot and cycle traffic but also for vehicles and on the local amenity.

(8) The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Amanda Whitbread

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 101/10 Fitzgerald St

Suburb: Newtown *Postcode* 2042.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- I do not accept that King Street traffic congestion will be improved by this project, There should be a complete review of the traffic modelling that does not appear to take sufficient notice of the impact of pouring 51000 extra cars down Euston Rd on top of increases in population in the area. Given that there is no outlet between the St Peters and Haberfield or Rozelle, all traffic going to the CBD, East or into the Inner West will use local roads.

- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. *"..... this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval"*. It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)

- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

- Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?

- An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Steph Toner
	Address: 46 Lennox St
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Newtown **Postcode** 2042.
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.
- The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage
- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.
- The consultants for the Social and Economic Impact study is HillPDA. This company has a conflict of interest and is not an appropriate choice to do a social impact study of WestCONnex. Amongst its services it offers property valuation services and promotes property development in what are perceived to be strategic locations. HillPDA were heavily involved in work leading to the development of Urban Growth NSW and the heavily criticised Parramatta Rd Study. It is not in the public interest to use public funds on an EIS done by a company that has such a heavy stake in property development opportunities along the Parramatta Rd corridor. One of the advantages of property development along Parramatta Rd that Hill PDA promotes on its website is the 33 kilometre WestCONnex.
- The EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONnex.
- The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.
- The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.
- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: JULIE THOMAS

Signature: Julie Thomas.

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 8/99 Turner St

Suburb: Arlfield. *Postcode* 2131

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- I am concerned that the AECOM, the company responsible for the EIS, always approves knocking down heritage buildings if the project requires it. It doesn't how much value it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.

- The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

- Are there other potentially serious problems with Sydney Water utility services (described at EIS 12-57) or with other utilities in other suburbs or along the proposed M4-M5 tunnel alignment ? If so, the EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these are all disclosed, researched, surveyed and the resolution publicly published.

- It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With four unfiltered emissions stacks in the area plus a large number of exit portals, the residents of this area will suffer greatly from poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that , the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic. " As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."

- I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.

- One of the main reasons for establishing Buruwan Park was as a relatively quiet nature corridor for wildlife not for successions of children's parties so the assessment of this area in the EIS is entirely blinkered and inaccurate. The Rozelle Rail Yards site that may appear to development driven planners as an unattractive and wasted eyesore is ironically a very important nature reserve. It is perhaps the only area in the Annandale/Glebe area were Fairy Wrens can be found because of the substantial bush cover. This is very important as where these birds are found nature tends to be in balance which is not the case in parks like Easton Park and Bicentennial Park.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: SAMIYA KHALID

Signature: [signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 177 MITCHELL RD

Suburb: ERSKINEVILLE *Postcode* 2043

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With four unfiltered emissions stacks in the area plus a large number of exit portals, the residents of this area will suffer greatly from poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that , the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic. " As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."

- Alternative access route for trucks – Leichhardt: The EIS states that there are 'investigations' occurring into alternative access to the Darley Road site. The EIS does not provide any detail on which residents can comment about alternative access which would keep trucks off Darley Road. The plans for alternative access should be expedited. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed and that no spoil trucks are permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates.

- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of **ground movement is lessened** where tunnelling is more than **35 metres underground.** (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg **John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres**(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

- The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. We now have proposals for Stages 1,2 and 3 and none achieve this goal. The community is asked to support this proposal on the basis of other major unfunded projects, which are little more than ideas on a map. This is NOT the way to plan a liveable city

- I object to the issue of this EIS only 14 days after the period for submission of comments on the concept design closed. There is no public response to the 1,000s of comments made on the design and it seems impossible that the comments could have been reviewed, assessed and responses to them incorporated into the EIS in that time. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.

- No noise barriers have been proposed. This is unacceptable and appropriate noise barriers should be included in the EIS for consideration. (Executive Summary xvii)

***Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

11

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: DAVID SERGENT

Signature: D.S.

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 154 WILSON ST

Suburb: NEWTOWN *Postcode* 2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

◊ The warm and caring words contained in the EIS, ref Sustainability Management Strategy, have not been reflected in the wanton destruction of homes, trees and habitat already. Why should we believe them?

◊ I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.

◊ The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels ? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.

◊ We object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that it provides for daily movements of 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road. This creates an unacceptable risk to the safety of pedestrians accessing the North Leichhardt light rail stop as well as bicycle users accessing the bicycle route on Darley Road and entering Canal road to join the dedicated bike paths on the bay run. Many school children cross at this point to walk to Orange Grove and Leichhardt Secondary College. The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link with no trucks to access Darley Road. The selection of Darley Road should not be approved if it involves any truck movements on Darley Road, which is what it currently provides.

◊ I completely reject the notion that unfiltered pollution stacks should be built anywhere in Sydney, let alone three or four in a single area. I am particularly concerned that schools would be near such unfiltered stacks. The government needs to urgently review its policy of support for unfiltered stacks.

◊ The increased amount of traffic the M4-M5 Link will dump on the roads to and from the St Peters, Haberfield and Rozelle Interchanges will disrupt local transport networks including bus and active transport (walking and cycling).

◊ It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

***Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Kate Burton Address: 60 ~~Erskine~~ Union St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Erskineville Postcode 2043
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- There is no statement on the level of accuracy
- and reliability of the traffic modelling process. This is a major shortcoming and is contrary to the Secretary's Environmental Assessments Requirements. Westconnex traffic modelling relies on implausible traffic volumes that exceed the capacity of the road links and intersections at several key locations.

- The great number of heritage houses in the Rozelle interchange construction zone has not been specifically addressed. Noise and vibration impacts can have far more significant impacts on these types of properties. There is no functional management plan for these risks, no articulated complaints investigation process nor any articulated compensation and remediation strategy.

- This is despite the RMS being the client for the Sydney Motorways Corporation. It would appear this is a deliberate strategy of the NSW Government to ensure local communities affected by construction traffic have no reasonable means of managing any complaint. It is undemocratic, against the principles of open government espoused in the election platform of the current government and ultimately escalates community unrest.(P 8-44)

- The EIS states that 'a preferred noise mitigation option' would be determined during 'detailed design'. This is unacceptable and residents have no opportunity to comment on the detailed designs. The failure to include this detail means that residents have no idea as to what is planned and cannot comment or input into those plans. (Executive Summary xvi)

- I object strongly to AECOM's approach to heritage. The methodology used is simply to describe heritage. If it interrupts the project plans, it simply must be destroyed. This is not an assessment at all. Plans to salvage items do have value but this value should not be used as a carrot to justify the removal of buildings.

- The traffic modelling process is not fit for purpose and places significant risks on the people of NSW in terms of:
  a) Traffic impacts that are significantly different to those presented in the EIS.
  b) Toll earnings that are significantly lower than projections – resulting in government subsidising the owner for lost earnings.

- The project objectives (Part 3.3 of EIS) include enabling the construction of motorways over the harbour and to the northern beaches. However, the traffic impacts of these motorways in Rozelle have not been assessed. These projects were not part of the business case that justified the WestConnex in the first place. This constant shifting of reasoning as to why the project is justified points to a desperation to find a reason to build it, rather than there being a clear need to be serviced.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name Ka Email Mobile

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Jane Trethewey
	Address: 12 Walker St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Redfern Postcode 2016
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

◊ The EIS shows that traffic on the City West Link, Johnston St, the Crescent, Catherine St and Ross street will greatly increase during the construction period and also be greatly increased by the time Stage 3 is completed. It states that Stage 3 will do nothing to improve traffic congestion in the area in fact it will add to the problem. Many of these areas are already congested at Peak times. This will be highly negative for the local area as more and more people try to avoid the congestion by using rat runs through the local areas on local streets.

◊ The mainline tunnel alignment was influenced by a number of factors between Haberfield and St Peters. It is very concerning that one of these factors, states that this route was decided on for: "Future connections to the motorway network". This is of particular concern in the light of the Camperdown interchange removal. Westconnex was forced to remove this interchange due to pressure from the RPA Hospital, Sydney University and The Chinese Embassy. Knowing that the Camperdown Interchange was wanted it is highly concerning to see this reference to future motorway connections but no disclosures outlining where these connections maybe. The EIS also states that in 2016 extending a tunnel link to the South side of the Gladesville Bridge was seriously considered rather than to the Iron Cove Bridge but this was shelved due to costs. In light of the way residents and home owners have been dealt with by Westconnex the fact that other areas are being considered for add on sectors to this project is of great concern.

◊ The management of water in the Rozelle Yards is of great concern as the site is highly contaminated and the construction work that will be carried out will cause a great deal of disturbance especially once vegetation has been removed. There will be potential impacts from contaminated soils, leakage/spills of hydrocarbons and other chemicals from machinery, vehicles transporting spoil adjacent to roads and stormwaters, rinse water from plant washing and concrete slurries. Water from tunnelling activity and other works will also introduce contaminants. The EIS says that much of this water will be treated in temporary treatment facilities and sediment tanks before being released to Whites Creek and Rozelle Bay. The EIS does not disclose what levels of pollution controls will be implemented to make sure that contaminated water is not released into White's Creek or Rozelle Bay. This is not acceptable.

◊ In 2033 with the M4 - M5 link the WRTM is forecasting reductions in peak travel times between the M4 corridor and the Sydney Airport/Port Botany area. The times savings that are quoted miniscule! Between Parramatta and Sydney Airport the time saving is 10 minutes. Between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saving is 5 minutes. Between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saving is 10 minutes. So for well over $20Billion all that can be saved is just a handful of minutes! This total waste of public money is completely unacceptable.

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Lachlan Short Signature: [signature] *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 41 Eve ST Suburb: ERSkineville Postcode 2043	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents.NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: KIRSTY DAGNALL Signature: [signature] *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 177 MITCHELL RD Suburb: ERSKINEVILLE Postcode: 2043	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

1. The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it.This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

2. The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

3. The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

4. The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

5. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

6. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5

7. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: MARY-LOUISE DELMAN

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

***Declaration** : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 65 MARLBOROUGH ST

Suburb: LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The impact of the deep tunnelling for the M4-M5 link - in addition to the tunnelling for the new Sydney Metro in the same area - in the Tempe, Sydenham, St Peters, Newtown and Camperdown and beyond is an unknown hazard to the soundness of the buildings above, and given that two different tunnelling operations will take place quite close, the people in those buildings will struggle to get repairs and compensation for loss because either contractor will no doubt blame the other.

- I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.

- It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With four unfiltered emissions stacks in the area plus a large number of exit portals, the residents of this area will suffer greatly from poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that , the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic. " As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."

- The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: KEVIN MEAGHER Signature: K Meagher *Please **include / delete (cross out or circle)** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 3-13 Erko Rd Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2042	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. *"The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in **Chapter 1**, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval".* The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.
- I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.
- Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.
- The assessment and solution to potentially serious problems described in the EIS at 12-57 (where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs) is *"based on assumptions about the strength and stiffness of the water tunnels given that limited information about the design and condition of these assets was available. Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water assets. A detailed assessment would be carried out in consultation with Sydney Water to demonstrate that construction of the M4-M5 Link tunnels would have negligible adverse settlement or vibration impacts on these tunnels. A settlement monitoring program would also be implemented during construction to validate or reassess the predictions should it be required."* The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday: 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday: 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
- The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels ? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Arasu Maheetharajah Signature: *Please **include / delete (cross out or circle)** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 130 Lancaster Avenue Suburb: Kensington Postcode 2033	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

- There has been no independent consideration of alternatives, in particular of a major expansion of commuter rail transport. The Department should reject this inadequate EIS and have a review of the flawed processes that have already led to massive expenditure on the inadequate option of privatised toll roads. This proposal is out of step with contemporary urban planning.
- I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.
- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. *"The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in **Chapter 1**, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval".* The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.
- I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.
- Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.
- The assessment and solution to potentially serious problems described in the EIS at 12-57 (where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs) is *"based on assumptions about the strength and stiffness of the water tunnels given that limited information about the design and condition of these assets was available. Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water assets. A detailed assessment would be carried out in consultation with Sydney Water to demonstrate that construction of the M4-M5 Link tunnels would have negligible adverse settlement or vibration impacts on these tunnels. A settlement monitoring program would also be implemented during construction to validate or reassess the predictions should it be required "* The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- SMC have made it all but impossible for the community to access hard copies of the EIS outside normal working and business hours. The Newtown Library only has one copy of the EIS, and has extremely limited opening hours. Monday and Wednesday: 10am to 7pm. Tuesday : 10am to 6pm. Thursday and Friday: 10am to 5pm. Saturday and Sunday : 11am to 4pm. This restricted access does NOT constitute open and fair community engagement.
- Given the high cost of the tolls and their anticipated annual increase it is also expected that there will be an increase on traffic generally on local roads as motorists avoid the tollways. This can already be seen on Parramatta Rd immediately the new M4 tolls were activated. We expect exactly the same effect in the roads around the interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St. Edgeware and Enmore Roads and through the streets of Erskineville and Alexandria.
- The EIS at 12-57 describes potentially serious problems where mainline tunnels alignment crosses key Sydney Water utility services that service Sydney's eastern and southern suburbs. Why is SMC proposing tunnelling within metres of these critical services when no accurate surveying has been done? And when there is only limited information available about the strength of these water tunnels ? The community can have no confidence in the EIS proposals that are incomplete and possibly negligent. The EIS proposals and application should not be approved till these issues are definitively resolved and publicly published.
- Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Beverley O'Neill

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 8 Martin Rd Centennial Pk

Suburb: 2021 Postcode 2021

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

A. At very minimum, the assessment of Strategic Alternative 1 (improvements to the existing arterial road network) should:

- **Identify key network capacity issues.**
- **Develop a scenario of investments in (potentially major) arterial road improvements required to address the road network capacity constraints. The City of Sydney's alternative scheme provides one example of what improvements to the existing arterial road network might look like.**
- **Carry out transport modelling and economic analysis to inform the assessment of the alternative.**

B. I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

C. The presence of 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day at this site will create an unacceptable risk to students. The EIS should not permit any truck movements near the Darley Road site. The alternative proposal which provides that all spoil trucks enter and leave from the City West link is the only proposal that should be considered.

D. It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?

E. The EIS at 7-21 states that Community update Newsletters were distributed to residents 'near the project footprint' in many suburbs. This statement is simply not correct. No such newsletters were received by residents in central and northern Newtown. SMC was made aware of this fact, but has not responded to verbal and written requests for audited confirmation of the addresses 'letterboxed'. This statement of community engagement should be rejected by the Department.

F. Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: TONY THEODORE

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 61 WRIGHT ST

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2037

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The EIS at 12-57 describes possible disruptions of water supply to a vast area of Sydney as a result of tunnelling in the proximity of two major Sydney Water Tunnels in the Newtown area, stating "Detailed surveys should be undertaken to verify the levels and condition of these Sydney Water Assets". Why has an EIS been published that infers that the tunnel alignments have been thoroughly surveyed and researched, when further survey work could dramatically alter the alignments in the future ?

- Permanent substation and water treatment plant - Residents on Darley Rd opposite the site and residents in Hubert St will have a direct line of site to the Motorway operation infrastructure. The resultant impact is a permanent degradation of the visual environment, is a loss of amenity and is detrimental to the community. This facility should not be permitted in this location and the EIS needs to demonstrate why it is required at this site. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site out of line of site of residents. The residual land should be returned for community purposes, such as green space, with future commercial uses ruled out. If the community is forced to endure 5 years of severe disruptions due to this toll road, the compensation should, at the very least, result in the land being returned to the community as green space.

- The EIS does not provide any opportunity to comment on the urban design and landscape component of the project. It states that 'a detailed review and finalisation of the architectural treatment of the project operational infrastructure would be undertaken 'during detailed design'. The Community should be given an opportunity to comment upon and influence the design and we object to the approval of the EIS on the basis that this detail is not provided, nor is the community (or other stakeholders) given an opportunity to comment or influence the final design.

- The justification for this project relies on the completion of other projects such as the Western Harbour Tunnel which has not yet been planned, let alone approved.

- The additional unfiltered exhaust stack on the north-west corner of the interchange will further increase the vehicle pollution in an area where the prevailing south and north-westerly winds will send that pollution over residences, schools and sports fields. The St Peters Primary School in particular will be at the apex of a triangle between the two exhaust stacks on the south-western and north-western corners of the interchange. This is utterly unacceptable.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: TERRY THEODORE

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 21 LEICHHARDT ST

Suburb: GLEBE Postcode 2037

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- **The EIS admits that impacts of construction of the M4-M5 Link will worsen traffic on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it is outrageous for motorists to be asked already to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.**

- **I object to this new tollway because in the past tolls have been justified as needed to pay for the new road. This is not the case of this tollway that will charge tolls for 40 years. This is only to guarantee revenue to the new private owner.**

- **There has never been any proper assessment of the cumulative impacts on heritage of the WestCONnex project. The loss of heritage in Concord, Haberfield and St Peters has been on a large scale and now the Stage 3 EIS shows that the M$/M5 tunnel would further add to this loss.**

- **The basic question that the people of NSW need answered by the EIS is For the same or lower cost of the project, could we do something that is different to the project that will deliver outcomes that are as good or better? The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS) require analysis of feasible alternatives to the project. No feasible alternatives have been developed and no objective analysis of alternatives has been undertaken. While Section 4.4 of the EIS purports to cover Strategic Alternatives, it does little more than offer a discussion of why an alternative was not pursued.**

- **I specifically object to the removal of the lighting tower and the Port Authority Building. These items are of considerable local significance and are representative of the operation of the Rozelle Rail Yards in the first part of the 20th century. I do not agree with trashing industrial history when it could be put to good community use.**

- **The EIS misrepresents the structure of the Global Economic Corridor and overstates the relationship of the project to centres within it by claiming the Project serves centres in the north of the GEC that it does not.**

- **The cited 'key customers' that would benefit from the project (long distance, freight, businesses) represent a very small minority of those who are forecast to actually use the project (single occupancy commuter vehicles). The key customers could be served by a far more modest project, given they represent an extremely small proportion of projected traffic on the Project.**

Campaign Mailing Lists: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ **Email** _____ **Mobile** _____

Attention: Director, Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: ORLENA STEELE-PRIOR	
Address: 48 George Street. Post Code 2204	Suburb Marrickville
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website (Yes) / No	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	
Signed: Orlena S P.	Date 1.10.17

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application #SSI 7485 for the reason(s) set out below.

Noise and disruption from construction

I object to the proposal for the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the noise and disruption impact it will have on residents during periods of extended construction. The proponent has a very poor track record of managing the impacts of Stages 1 and 2 of this project. In addition, the conditions of approval are so broad as to make enforcing compliance with Council or EPA regulations impossible. The protections for residents are ineffectual and the abuse of the Critical State Significant Infrastructure powers is continuous.

The reality for residents living with the Stages 1 and 2 of WestConnex is night after night of disruption and disturbance with no respite and no way of enforcing compliance. In addition, the policy for mitigation entitlements such as noise protection or respite accommodation is not transparent and is discretionary. Many residents especially the most vulnerable such as those in rental properties or in public housing are unwilling to complain about their situation.

In St Peters in mid-September 2017 the Stage 2 Joint venture's contractors were digging up pipes all one weekend, resulting in two burst water mains. They worked through Saturday night until after 1am on Sunday morning when they should have finished at 6pm on Saturday. Many of the residents were without water for much of the weekend. On Monday night at 8.30pm RMS turned up unannounced with concrete saws and jackhammers. On Tuesday night, RMS were supposed to stop at 6pm but again the work until after midnight. A resident whose bedroom was right next door to the work, posted a video of the deafening concrete saws in use after midnight with the caption "It's impossible to live here at the moment". Many local residents are unaware of the construction impacts and that there will be months of construction work which will have to take place out of hours. The EIS does not specify which works to establish the site will take place during standard construction hours.

The Department of Planning and Environment should oppose the approval of the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because alternatives are available which will have less impact on residents or which will impact fewer residents during the construction phase. These alternatives should be assessed. If not suitable then the proponent must do without a dive site. It is not acceptable to treat communities like this. The mistakes of Stages 1 and 2 should not be repeated.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: ORLENA STEELE-PRIOR
	Address: 48 George St.
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Marrickville Postcode 2204
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: Orlena S.P.

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS admits that the increased traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange will impact on bus running times especially in the evening peak hour and increase the time taken (2.5 minutes, which seems optimistic). The 422 bus and associated cross city services which use the Princes Highway are notorious for irregular running times because of the congestion on the Princes highway and cross roads, so an admitted worsening of the running time will adversely impact the people who are dependent on the buses. This will be compounded by the loss of train services at St Peters station while it is closed for the Sydney Metro build and then subsequently when it re-opens. In all the impact of the new M5 and the M4-M5 link is to worsen access to public transport significantly for the residents of the St Peters neighbourhood.

- The Concept Design was a woefully inadequate document totally devoid of any real depth of detail in terms of maps, scales, distances with only vague suggestions and glamorized Artist's Impressions of an idealized view of what Stage 3 would be like. It was another example of current city planning documents that consistently accentuate huge areas of tranquil green spaces with families and children out walking and riding bicycles in idealized parks and suburbs. All this is total PR spin and bears no reality about the real outcome of the build. It bears no reality as to what Stage 3 of Westconnex will be like.
- There has been no 'meaningful' consultation with the community. Some areas affected by M3/M5 have not even been letterboxed by SMC. These include St Peters and sections of Erskineville. The SMC received hundreds of submissions on its concept design and failed to respond to any of these before lodging this EIS.

- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

- It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area, Rozelle

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Julie Lardner Signature: *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 21 LEICHHARDT ST Suburb: GLEBE Postcode 2037	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

i. An on-line interactive map was published with the M4-M5 Concept Design that indicated a very wide yellow 'swoosh' that is upwards of a kilometre wide in some sections of the M4-M5 proposals. SMC have NEVER publicly published or acknowledged that the contractor to be appointed to build the tunnels will be 'encouraged' to do so within the yellow swoosh footprint, but may go outside the indicative swoosh area if found necessary after further geotech and survey work. The proposed Sydney Water Tunnels surveys (EIS 12-57) could potentially see a dramatic change in the tunnel alignments in the Newtown area. Why were these surveys not done during the past three years such that 'definitive' rather than 'indicative' alignments could be published. The EIS should be withdrawn till such time that it is a true and fair 'definitive' document open for genuine public comment.

ii. Traffic operational modelling – Leichhardt. The EIS does not provide any operational modelling for the Darley Road area (8-11), despite the fact 170 vehicles a day are proposed to enter this highly congested (during peak hours) area. Darley Road is a critical arterial road for commuters accessing the City West Link and this analysis should be provided so that impacts can be properly assessed.

iii. The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction.(Executive Summary xviii)

iv. The Rozelle Rail Yards are a totally inappropriate area to create a new recreational area because the area will be highly polluted by unfiltered Pollution Stacks and Tunnel Portals. In the EIS it is referred to as an idealized area."It is envisaged that the quantum of active recreation within the Rozelle Rail Yards would be further developed by others as projects such as The Bays Precinct are developed. The concept plan provides spaces that could include an array of active recreation opportunities and even community facilities such as gardens or a school." The suggestion that this would be a suitable location for a School is just beyond belief and demonstrates that those who have put these plans together are either staggeringly ignorant or totally delusional! At a time when major World cities are doing all they can to address the dire problems of pollution this is an appalling suggestion that is totally out of touch.

v. Insufficient time has been given for the community to prepare submissions to the EIS, especially when one considers that whole neighbourhoods affected by the project were not even notified during the concept design period. e.g Newtown, east of King St.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Kate Pascoe

Signature: .....

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 39 Mary St

Suburb: St Peters *Postcode* 2044

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

i. Cumulative construction impacts - Camperdown. The EIS states that residents will likely be subject to cumulative construction impacts as several tunnelling works activities may operate simultaneously (10-119, EIS) No mitigation steps are proposed to ease this impact on those affected.

ii. The EIS is based on the fallacy that the M4 and-M5 need linking when they are already linked by the M7, A6 and A3. The A3 is the primary eastern link between the two motorways and is shown in the State Road network hierarchy as the M4-M5 Connector.

iii. I am concerned that the AECOM, the company responsible for the EIS, always approves knocking down heritage buildings if the project requires it. It doesn't how much value it holds for the community, it must always be destroyed.

iv. Ground-borne out-of-hours work - Camperdown The EIS acknowledges the noise and vibration impacts and the need for work to occur outside of standard daytime construction hours. It simply states that 'the specific management strategy for addressing potential impacts associated with ground-borne noise...would be documented in the OOHW protocol. This is inadequate as the community have no opportunity to comment on the OOHW protocol or the management of the ongoing impacts to which they will be subjected.

v. I strongly object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link for a multitude of reasons, including :
   - It is a toll road project made for big business, searching for a rationale.
   - It fails to meet the primary objectives of providing a direct motorway connection between Western Sydney and Sydney Airport and Port.
   - The Environmental Impact Statement does not safeguard communities. Government is seeking planning approval to sell the project to the private sector and discharging its responsibility and control for the delivery of the project.
   - There is a lack of strategic justification for the project, No feasible alternatives have been developed or assessed.
   - There will be major impacts on the Anzac Bridge (projected 60% increase in daily traffic) and Sydney City Centre. The EIS forecasts major impacts on bus travel time and reliability.
   - The EIS does not adequately account for impacts on health and air quality. The EIS identifies an additional 5 unfiltered ventilation stacks to be constructed in inner Sydney. In addition local surface roads will be widened and traffic volumes will increase.
   - Lack of alignment with the NSW Government's priorities and policies
   - Major impacts on the community
   - Legacy Impacts and worsening intergenerational equity
   - Other global cities are investing in fast and efficient public transport that truly connects homes and jobs, supports the decentralisation of commercial investment and develops a resilient and equitable city for future generations.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Guy Duncan

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 503/570 NEW CANTERBURY RD

Suburb: HURLSTONE PARK *Postcode* 2193

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

1. The EIS admits that air pollutants will exceed permitted levels along the Canal Rd used to access the St Peters Interchange because the traffic will be heavier. This is an unacceptable impact which will adversely affect vehicle users because it is known that people in their vehicles are not protected from the air pollution, as well as anyone on foot or cycling in the streets around the interchange. No amelioration is offered.

2. The EIS states that traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange is expected to be worse after completion of the M5 and the M4-M5 Link particularly in the evening peak hour. The EIS admits that this will have a "moderate negative" impact on the neighbourhood in increasing pollution (also admitted separately) therefore in health impacts, on safety for foot and cycle traffic but also for vehicles and on the local amenity.

3. The traffic around St Peters expected to be heavier because of the increased road access to the new Interchange will adversely affect our community because moving around to our parks and to the shops, to the buses and to the train stations, for pedestrians and cars, will be more difficult. Our community is being sacrificed for the marginal improvement in traffic movement elsewhere in Sydney. No measures to ameliorate the impact are mentioned. This is unacceptable.

4. The EIS admits that the increased traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange will impact on bus running times especially in the evening peak hour and increase the time taken (2.5 minutes, which seems optimistic). The 422 bus and associated cross city services which use the Princes Highway are notorious for irregular running times because of the congestion on the Princes highway and cross roads, so an admitted worsening of the running time will adversely impact the people who are dependent on the buses. This will be compounded by the loss of train services at St Peters station while it is closed for the Sydney Metro build and then subsequently when it re-opens. In all the impact of the new M5 and the M4-M5 link is to worsen access to public transport significantly for the residents of the St Peters neighbourhood.

5. It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Jessica Thornton

Signature: Jessica Thornton

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 33 Holmwoods St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective.

- The mainline tunnel alignment was influenced by a number of factors between Haberfield and St Peters. It is very concerning that one of these factors, states that this route was decided on for: "Future connections to the motorway network". This is of particular concern in the light of the Camperdown interchange removal, Westconnex was forced to remove this interchange due to pressure from the RPA Hospital, Sydney University and The Chinese Embassy. Knowing that the Camperdown Interchange was wanted it is highly concerning to see this reference to future motorway connections but no disclosures outlining where these connections maybe. The EIS also states that in 2016 extending a tunnel link to the South side of the Gladesville Bridge was seriously considered rather than to the Iron Cove Bridge but this was shelved due to costs. In light of the way residents and home owners have been dealt with by Westconnex the fact that other areas are being considered for add on sectors to this project is of great concern.

- The modelling area shown in Figure 8-5 should be extended to include Johnston Street and The Crescent/Minogue Crescent/Ross Street corridor to Parramatta Road to provide clarity on how these feeder routes are envisaged to operate in 2023 and 2033. It should include the modelling assumptions applied

- Acquisition of Dan Murphys – I object to the acquisition of this site on the basis that Dan Murphys renovated and started a new business in December 2016, in full knowledge that they were to be acquired, with the acquisition process commencing early November 2016. This is maladministration of public money and the tax payer should not be left to foot the compensation bill in these circumstances

- The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Gilbert Waddell **Address:** 12 Holmwood St
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Newtown **Postcode** 2042
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:** G Waddell
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

I. The EIS social an economic impact study acknowledged the high value placed on retaining trees and vegetation in the affected area but does not mention that WestCONnex has already destroyed more than 1000 trees in the St Peters Alexandria area around Sydney Park alone.

II. The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.

III. The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.

IV. I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

V. The EIS acknowledges that impacts of construction should M4M5 get approval will worsen traffic congestions on Parramatta Rd. In these circumstances it would be outrageous for motorists to be asked to pay up to up to $20 a day in tolls. I object to the fact that this is not considered or factored into the traffic analysis.

VI. Streets in Haberfield would be subject to heavy vehicle traffic for a further four years, making at least 7 years of heavy impacts on a single suburb. The answer is not a "community strategy'. Residents who believed that their pain would be over after the M4 east are now being asked to sustain a further four years of impacts. No compensation or serious mitigation is suggested.

VII. The EIS acknowledges that four years of M4/M5 construction would have a negative economic and social impact across the Inner West through interrupted traffic routes, slower traffic times, disruption with public transport, interruption with businesses and loss of connections across communities. This finding highlights the need for a proper cost benefit analysis for the project. Such social costs should not simply be dismissed with the promise of a construction plan into which the community has not input or powers to enforce.

VIII. I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: Alexandra Spence

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 32/151 B SMITH ST

Suburb: SUMMER HILL Postcode: 2130

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

- I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.

- Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for workers(EiS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.

- I am deeply disappointed that the EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain. This is a dangerous and reckless attempt to get approval for a project that is yet to be properly designed.
- There will be increases of noise in the area of Johnston St where traffic volumes will increase. Residents will be more susceptible to health impacts associated with increased noise. In the EIS it is stated that residents may have to keep their windows closed. They may well experience sleep disturbance and interference of living activities like eating outdoors. However the EIS considers this to be only moderately negative. This is not acceptable.

- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name:.....Dona HARDY. ABSOURCES.....	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature:.....	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: .....54 Alfred Street.....	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: .....St Peters.....Postcode..2044..	

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

- *Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates and unacceptable risk of damage to homes due to settlement (ground movement). The EIS acknowledges that at tunnelling at 35 metres and less this is a real risk. There is no mitigation provided for this risk. Instead, it states that properties will be repaired at the Government's expense. However no details or assurance as to how this will occur are provided. The project should not be approved with such tunnelling depths permitted and with no detail as to the extent of damage and how and when it will be repaired. It will lead to the situation where residents and businesses are forced to engage structural engineers and lawyers to prove that the damage was linked to Westconnex works, with no assurance that this property damage will be promptly and satisfactorily fixed.*

- *Heavy vehicle movements during peak hours – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'reasonable and practical management strategies would be investigated to minimize the volume of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours.' (8-53). This is also not acceptable as it is not known what will actually be done to manage this impact. It is not good enough for the EIS, which forms the basis of the approval of this project, to simply mention 'investigations' and not detail a proper plan (on which residents can comment) on management of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours. In addition, Darley Road is very congested from 7am until 9.30am and then from 4pm-6.30pm, well outside the 'peak' periods identified in the EIS. And the impact on traffic will be caused by 'light' vehicles and not simply heavy vehicles. It is clear that there is no plan for managing these vehicle movements. The EIS should not be approved as drafted. It is unacceptable for this volume of vehicles to be proposed for this critical arterial road with no plan for management*

- *EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the Process for addressing project uncertainties. "The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. As such, it is to be expected that some uncertainties exist that will need to be resolved during detailed design and construction and operational planning. As described in **Chapter 1**, construction contractors (for each stage of the project) would be engaged during detailed design to provide greater certainty on the exact locations of temporary and permanent facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction methodology to be adopted. This may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval". The EIS should not be approved till the bulk of these 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.*

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email_____Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Katrina Baxter

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 418 King Street

Suburb: Newtown *Postcode* 2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents.NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Andrew Ball
	Address: 4 Hillcrest Street
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode NSW
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

a. I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.

b. I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.

c. Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)

d. Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat – the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.

e. I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

f. I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Andrew Ball **Address:** 4 Hillcrest Street
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Leichhardt **Postcode** NSW
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

i. 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

ii. There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

iii. 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

iv. 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

v. I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents.NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # ~~SSI~~ 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Andrew Ball

Signature: [signature]

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 4 Hillcrest Street,

Suburb: Leichhardt NSW Postcode 2206

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.

- There are estimated 100 heavy and 70 light vehicle movements a day and the plan is to allow a right-hand turn into Darley Road from the CW Link. The trucks will drive onto Darley Road, turn right into the site and then left back out onto the CW Link, which is unrealistic given the amount of traffic on these roads now.

- EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) states. "..... *this may result in changes to both the project design and the construction methodologies described and assessed in this EIS. Any changes to the project would be reviewed for consistency with the assessment contained in the EIS including relevant mitigation measures, environmental performance outcomes and any future conditions of approval".* It is unstated just who would have responsibility for such a "review(ed) for consistency", and how these changes would be communicated to the community. The EIS should not be approved till significant 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment (ie : the Sydney Water Tunnels issues at 12-57)

- The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.

- The consultants for the Social and Economic Impact study is HillPDA. This company has a conflict of interest and is not an appropriate choice to do a social impact study of WestCONnex. Amongst its services it offers property valuation services and promotes property development in what are perceived to be strategic locations. HillPDA were heavily involved in work leading to the development of Urban Growth NSW and the heavily criticised Parramatta Rd Study. It is not in the public interest to use public funds on an EIS done by a company that has such a heavy stake in property development opportunities along the Parramatta Rd corridor. One of the advantages of property development along Parramatta Rd that Hill PDA promotes on its website is the 33 kilometre WestCONnex.

- There have been widespread reports in the media about extensive unresolved disputes regarding damages to houses in the Stage 1 M4 and Stage 2 M5 construction process. Why should the community believe that there will not be extensive damages to houses in Stage 3 ?

- The EIS states that an alternative truck movement is proposed which involves use of the City West Link and no need for spoil trucks to access Darley Road. This proposal is supported, subject to further information about potential impacts being provided. The EIS should not be approved on its current basis which provides for 170 heavy and light vehicles accessing Darley Road on a daily basis. This will create unacceptable safety issues and noise impacts for adjacent homes while also compromising pedestrian and bicycle access to the light rail and bay run. It will also lead to truck chaos on this critical arterial road providing access to and across the City west Link. The current proposal which provides for truck movements solely on Darley Road should not be approved and approval should only be given to the alternative proposal. I repeat however my objection to the selection of this site altogether, but propose the least worst impact should be chosen if this site is to be used.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Andrew Ball

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 2 Hillcrest Street

Suburb: Tempe NSW Postcode 2206

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, with predicted adverse impacts on breathing and through long-term carcinogenic effects. The maps and analysis of the pollution effects in the EIS should be presented in a way that enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.

- A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a 'temporary' imposition.
- The EIS at 7-51 refers to concerns that were raised by the community that the alignment of tunnels in Newtown appeared to go to the east of King Street, an area that had had no geotech drilling or testing. SMC staff indicated at Community information sessions that the maps included in the Concept Design were broad and indicative only, and that further details would be available in the EIS. No further details have been provided. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process

- The EIS at 7-41 acknowledges that there is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will be made a 24 hour clearway, stating "Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street". This statement is deliberately misleading - it infers that SMC has authority in controlling impacts on regional roads. Roads and Maritime have the unfettered right to declare Clearways wherever and whenever they wish, and RMS has **NEVER** stated publicly that King Street will not be subject to extended clearway.

- I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

- Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.

- It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The EIS Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: Tenzin Lamee

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 14/2-18 Newman Street

Suburb: Newtown Postcode 2042

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Additional facilities. The EIS states that the contractor may decide upon additional 'construction ancillary facilities' to the 12 identified in the EIS. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that there may be more unidentified sites taken, as residents will have no opportunity to comment on their impacts. The approval condition should limit any construction facilities to those already notified and detailed in the EIS.

- The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.

- The EIS states that darley Road is a contaminated site, and likely has asbestos. The proposal is that 'treated' water will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. We object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons. There is no detail of the ongoing Motorway maintenance activities during operation provided in the EIS. The community therefore cannot comment on the impact that this ongoing facility will have on the locality. This component of the EIS should not be approved as this information is not provided and therefore impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not known.

- Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.

- Permanent water treatment plant and substation – Leichhardt The proposal to locate this permanent structure in a residential setting is opposed. The site will have a negative visual impact on the area and is in direct line of sight of a number of homes. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site further from homes.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001*	Name: Robert Pranjic
	Address: 84 Fifth Ave Llandilo
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Postcode: 2747
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- I object to the whole project because it will force people into cars instead of expanding public transport. Out west the majority of commuters to the city use the trains and don't drive. It would be far better to spend the money on improving the train service, not building a huge expensive tollway.

- I object because the people of Western Sydney were never consulted about where they wanted new roads or what transport they prefer. The WestConnex project with the high tolls increasing every year was just dumped on Western Sydney residents.

- For a small part of the money for this project the railway signal system and the rails could have been modernised and upgraded. Western Sydney could have more frequent and faster services which would really benefit the communities west of Parramatta. What Western Sydney commuters really need is an extension of the heavy rail train system. I object to the fact that this choice was never presented to us.

- I object to 43 years of the tolls. This has been imposed on drivers as income for a private motorway owner-operator. The fact that the toll is based on distance travelled disadvantages people who live on the western side of the Sydney region.

- The tolls will be a heavier burden in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, Blacktown or Wetherill Park where households on average have lower household incomes compared to the inner suburbs. It is quite unfair when the all benefits of Stage 3 are for north-south connections to the northern beaches or the proposed new harbour tunnel.

- The point of the original WestConnex project was a direct route to the airport and Port Botany This is not even part of WestConnex. But the new M5 and the new M4-M5 Link will dump 1,000s more per day onto the roads to the Airport which are already at capacity. I object to the push for the M4-M5 link when there are still no plans for the Sydney Gateway to deal with the increased traffic.

The Secretary of Planning should refuse approval for this project.

Campaign Mailing Lists :I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name_____ Email_____ Mobile _____

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: Liz Mackie

Signature: Mackie

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

***Declaration** : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 18 Keir Avenue

Suburb: Hurlstone Park Postcode 2193

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The EIS contains no detail of the access tunnel from the Darley Road site to the mainline tunnel other than depicting the route. The approval conditions need to ensure that tunnelling is occurring at sufficient depth so as to not jeopardise the integrity of the homes and not create unacceptable vibration and noise impacts for James Street residents and those at adjacent streets. The approval conditions need to make clear the period of time for which the 'temporary' tunnel is to be used.

- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur. It states that subsidence may occur along tunnel paths due to tunnel excavation and water drawdown. The risk of ground movement and subsidence is greater where tunnels are less than 35 metres underground. The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels in that area which are a great deal less than 35metres. The same is true for areas of Rozelle where layers of tunnels are proposed. This will definitely lead to structural damage and cracking to homes above. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage. This is not acceptable

- The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards Site are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. On ground construction Mon-Fri 7.00am - 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am-1.00pm. However as has been experienced by those at Haberfield and St Peters these hours and especially late and night work have been extended and implemented when the schedules have fallen behind and this has lead to great physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially for those with children. The roads and sites at night in the area will see a marked increase in noise from truck movements, truck reversing alarms and running machinery. It will also see a marked increase in light during the night hours with site illumination and vehicle head lights as has been experienced in other areas. These problems have not been addressed in the EIS.

- Heritage items - Camperdown. The EIS also acknowledges that the use of a rock-breaker at the outer extents of the project footprint will affect 73 residences, with five heritage items identified as having the potential to be within the 'minimum safe working distance'. While some mitigation 'considered', it is not mandated and the requirement to mitigate is limited to 'where feasible and reasonable'. The mitigation proposed seems in any event to comprise letter-boxing residents about the likely impacts! The protection of heritage items should be mandated, not just considered and there should be a strict requirement to protect such heritage items.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Suze Pratten Signature: [signature] *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 213 Putty Rd Suburb: Coco Postcode 2756	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, **and ask that the Minister reject the application and require preparation of a genuine, not indicative, EIS**

A. *Heavy vehicle movements during peak hours – Leichhardt. The EIS states that 'reasonable and practical management strategies would be investigated to minimize the volume of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours.' (8-53). This is also not acceptable as it is not known what will actually be done to manage this impact. It is not good enough for the EIS, which forms the basis of the approval of this project, to simply mention 'investigations' and not detail a proper plan (on which residents can comment) on management of heavy vehicle movements during peak hours. In addition, Darley Road is very congested from 7am until 9.30am and then from 4pm-6.30pm, well outside the 'peak' periods identified in the EIS. And the impact on traffic will be caused by 'light' vehicles and not simply heavy vehicles. It is clear that there is no plan for managing these vehicle movements. The EIS should not be approved as drafted. It is unacceptable for this volume of vehicles to be proposed for this critical arterial road with no plan for management*

B. *The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.*

C. *It is stated that if congestion proves to be a problem then other solutions will have to be found. Other routes that are being considered will be using the Western Distributor, the Crescent, Victoria Rd, Ross St, Pyrmont Bridge Rd and Johnston St. The Crescent and Johnston St are clearly going to be used. This despite the fact that in a consultation those representing Westconnex assured residents of Annandale that neither Johnston St or Booth St would be used. It is expected that these routes will also be used for night transport. It is clear that it is unlikely that transportation routes shown in the EIS will be adhered to. This is unacceptable.*

D. *Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat - the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.*

E. *Discharge of water into storm water at Blackmore Oval – Leichhardt The permanent substation and water treatment plant proposed for the Darley Road site facility should not be approved as part of the EIS. It proposes discharging water from the tunnels into the storm water canal near Blackmore Oval. This will devastate our waterways and impact negatively on the amenity of the bay which has four rowing clubs in close proximity. In addition, the environmental impacts of this discharge are not properly set out in the EIS.*

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director *Application Number: SSI 7485* *Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,* *Department of Planning and Environment* *GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001* *Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link*	*Name:* Irene Rydge *Signature:* *Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.* *I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* *Address:* 36 Warner St *Suburb:* Gladesville *Postcode* 2111

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

A. THE LATEST EIS WAS RELEASED JUST TEN BUSINESS DAYS AFTER FEEDBACK PERIOD ENDED FOR THE CONCEPT DESIGN FOR THE M4/M5 AND BEFORE PRELIMINARY DRILLING TO ESTABLISH A ROUTE THROUGH THE INNER WEST IS COMPLETED. WHAT IS THE RUSH? THIS EIS IS LITTLE MORE THAN A CONCEPT DESIGN AND IS FAR LESS DEVELOPED THAN EARLIER ONES. IT IS COMPOSED OF MANY INDICATE ONLY PLANS SUCH THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO KNOW WHAT THE IMPACTS WILL BE AND YET APPROVAL IS BEING SOUGHT IN A RUSH. THE EIS IGNORES MORE THAN 1500 SUBMISSIONS, INCLUDING ONE OF 142 PAGES FROM THE INNER WEST COUNCIL.

B. ONE TOLL ROAD LEADS TO ANOTHER 3 BEING PROPOSED. THE EIS'S FOR THE M4 EAST AND THE NEW M5 ARGUED THE CASE THAT SERIOUS CONGESTION CREATED NEAR INTERCHANGES WOULD BE SOLVED ONCE THE M4/M5 WAS BUILT. NOW IT SEEMS THIS IS NOT THE CASE AND MORE ROADS WILL BE NEEDED TO RELIEVE THE CONGESTION – WHERE DOES THIS END? ACCORDING TO THE M4/M5 EIS THE REAL BENEFITS WILL DEPEND ON BUILDING THE WESTERN HARBOUR TUNNEL, THE AIRPORT LINK AND A TOLLWAY HEADING SOUTH. NONE OF THESE PROJECTS HAVE BEEN PLANNED, LET ALONE APPROVED BUT YET ARE PART OF ADDRESSING THE CONGESTION IMPACTS ACKNOWLEDGED FOR THE M4/M5LINK PROJECT. GIVEN THIS HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO KNOW OR ADDRESS THE IMPACTS OF THE M4/M5 LINK, UNLESS THIS IS JUST YET MORE JUSTIFICATION FOR YET MORE ROADS?

C. RESEARCH ABOUT ROADS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES THAT ROADS CREATE CONGESTION. THE WESTCONNEX PROJECT IS NO DIFFERENT AND THE EIS CLEARLY INDICATES THAT THIS IS AN IMPACT OF THE M4/M5 AND THE CONSEQUENT ROADS THAT WILL FOLLOW. WHERE WILL THIS END AS THE M4/M5 LINK EIS ITSELF INDICATES THE RMS IS ALREADY HARD AT WORK CONSIDERING HOW TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS – OF CONGESTION CAUSED BY ROADS.

D. WHERE IS THE COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND TO LONG TERM PLANNING WHEN THE EIS FOR THE M4/M5 LINK IS RELEASED BEFORE ANY RESPONSE TO THE EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK ON THE M4-M5 LINK CONCEPT DESIGN COULD POSSIBLY HAVE BEEN SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED. THIS DEMONSTRATES DEEP GOVERNMENT CONTEMPT FOR THE PEOPLE OF NSW AND THE COMMUNITIES OF THE INNER WEST OF SYDNEY IN PARTICULAR.

E. THE EIS WAS PREPARED BY GLOBAL ENGINEERING FIRM AECOM, WHICH ALSO PREPARED THE EIS FOR STAGES 1 AND 2. WHEN HE APPROVED THESE EARLIER STAGES, THE THEN MINISTER FOR PLANNING ROB STOKES POINTED TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THAT WOULD MINIMISE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES. BUT THE IMPACTS HAVE TURNED OUT TO WORSE THAN EXPECTED.

F. FOR EXAMPLE, THE AECOM EIS FOR THE NEW M5 FAILED TO DEAL WITH HOW THE MASSIVELY CONTAMINATED LAND FILL AT ALEXANDRIA WOULD BE MANAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION. AFTER MONTHS OF SICKENING ODOURS, THE NSW EPA ADMITS THAT DESPITE FINING SMC AND REQUIRING CONTRACTORS TO TAKE MEASURES TO CONTROL ODOURS, THEY HAVE NOT STOPPED. IT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT IT DOES NOT HAVE THE POWER TO STOP WORK UNTIL WESTCONNEX CONTRACTORS COMPLY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Lord Litchfield
	Address: 56 Warner St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Gladesville Postcode 2111
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- **I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.**

- **I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.**

- **Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)**

- **Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat – the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.**

- **I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.**

- **I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.**

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: Arun Mahenthiraraja

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
***Declaration** : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 130 Doncaster Avenue

Suburb: Kensington Postcode: 2033

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution– most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times.

- The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements fn project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.

- All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street) should have a strict prohibition on any truck movements and worker contractor parking. These homes are already suffering the worst construction impacts of the work on the site and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and additional noise impacts. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all of these streets.

- The EIS indicates that 36 homes will have unacceptable noise impacts for extended periods at the Darley road construction site. The EIS does not mention the cumulative impact of aircraft noise in the Leichhardt or St Peters area, and therefore does not reflect the true impact of construction noise on the amenity of nearby residents and businesses. The noise impacts of construction are not able to be mitigated to an acceptable level and the EIS should not be approved on this basis.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention: Director, Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485
Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Margaret Sheppard	
Address: 52 Boyce St Post Code 2039	Suburb Glebe
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / ~~No~~	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	
Signed:	Date 26-9-17

- **Traffic and transport - construction worker parking**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because it is inevitable that workers will end up parking in streets near to the site and this will impact on residents in a number of ways.

- Residents will be competing for parking with both workers and commuters who already park in the streets near the light rail. Most houses in the streets near the site do not have off-street parking so residents are already pressed for parking spaces. During the renovation of the Darley Rd site for the Dan Murphys in 2016 workers parked in local roads like Charles St, Hubert St, Darley Rd and Francis St even when there was parking on site. This was of great inconvenience to residents especially those with young children and the aged. Residents had to complain to Woolworths and to the contractor Flexem on numerous occasions.
- Residents will be disturbed by workers arriving for or leaving from shifts at anti-social hours. Residents who work shifts and need to rest during the day will be disturbed by the additional noise of vehicles coming and going.
- During the renovation of the Darley Rd site for the Dan Murphys in 2016 there were instances of workers parking with engines idling first thing in the morning disturbing residents.

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because there is no plan for worker parking and as a result the residents of Charles St, Hubert St, Darley Rd and Francis St will not be able to park on their streets and will be adversely impacted by worker parking.

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Alternatives have been identified which provide adequate worker parking and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

I submit my strongest objections to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: SENTHIL JAYARAMAN

Signature:

Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
Declaration: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 38 KARUAH ST

Suburb: STRATHFIELD Postcode 2135

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

◊ There has never been any proper assessment of the cumulative impacts on heritage of the WestCONnex project. The loss of heritage in Concord, Haberfield and St Peters has been on a large scale and now the Stage 3 EIS shows that the M$/M5 tunnel would further add to this loss.

◊ The Rozelle Rail Yards site is the location of 3 Unfiltered Pollution Stacks. There is a fourth stack on Victoria Rd close to Darling St. If the Western Harbour Tunnel is built there will also be a total of 7 Tunnel Portals. Tunnel Portals are also areas of high levels of pollution. It is totally unacceptable that the Pollution Stacks are unfiltered. In 2008 Gladys Berejiklian said of Labor "It's not too late, the Government can still ensure that filtration is a possibility. World's best practice is to filter tunnels. Why won't Labor allow people to sleep at night, knowing their children aren't inhaling toxins that could jeopardize their health now or in the future." It is totally unacceptable that the tunnels will not be filtered. Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants.

◊ The basic question that the people of NSW need answered by the EIS is For the same or lower cost of the project, could we do something that is different to the project that will deliver outcomes that are as good or better? The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS) require analysis of feasible alternatives to the project. No feasible alternatives have been developed and no objective analysis of alternatives has been undertaken. While Section 4.4 of the EIS purports to cover Strategic Alternatives, it does little more than offer a discussion of why an alternative was not pursued.

◊ There is no reliable evidence presented (or available) that building motorways reduces traffic congestion over the long term. No major urban arterial road project, without carefully considered and implemented pricing signals, has succeeded in easing congestion for more than a few years. This is universally acknowledged in planning disciplines, and is replicated by the Future Transport website, has been stated by the current Minister for Transport and the current Premier (during her time as Shadow Minister for Transport).

◊ I specifically object to the removal of the lighting tower and the Port Authority Building. These items are of considerable local significance and are representative of the operation of the Rozelle Rail Yards in the first part of the 20th century. I do not agree with trashing industrial history when it could be put to good community use.

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: TINA BIDESE

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website
***Declaration** : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 19 ALLBONE ST

Suburb: ASHBURY Postcode 2193

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- EIS is Indicative only - Pyrmont bridge Road site - The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. This is because the EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only' and is subject to 'detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.'

- The EIS gives no information about changes to traffic increases entering the Sydney CBD caused by the Westconnex. Duncan Gay when asked about this, in connection to huge increases of traffic predicted to enter the city from Westconnex at St Peters, would only say that traffic would disperse! So thousands of extra vehicles would magically disperse – where? There is no plan for this. RMS has only just started work to identify which roads will need to be upgraded to deal with these vast numbers of extra vehicles entering the city. So it is impossible to form an understanding of the true Environmental impacts of this project – which is the very purpose of an EIS.

- The removal of Buruwan Park for road widening and the realignment of the Crescent is a particular loss of badly needed parkland. This park was established as a nature corridor and a buffer to shield the local residents from City West Link, there are mature trees on this site, it was not intended as a children's recreational area with play equipment, the description in the EIS is inaccurate. Buruwan Park also has a main cycle route running through it. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no account of encouraging cycling as a mode of transport. The alternative routes are based on distance only and take no account of time taken or topography. Had this been done then this would have changed the assessment for the removal of the existing cycle/walkway bridge over the City West link. There is also no mention of this bridge being replaced after construction of the Westconnex. This is not acceptable.

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: PETER KINNAIRD

Signature: P K

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 19 AINSWORTH ST

Suburb: CLIFFIELD Postcode 2063

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

A. *It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle*

B. *The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement may occur. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. In addition, the EIS states that there are a number of discrete areas to the north and northwest of the Rozelle Rail Yards, to the north of Campbell Road at St Peters and in the vicinity of Lord Street at Newtown where ground water movement above 20 milliliters is predicted 'strict limits on the degree of settlement permitted would be imposed on the project" and 'damage' would be rectified at no cost to the owner. would be placed (Executive Summary, xvii -iii). The project should not be permitted to be delivered in such a way that there is a known risk to property damage that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level of risk.*

C. *It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.*

D. *The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.*

E. *I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.*

F. *I do not consider it acceptable that cycling/pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.*

G. *602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective.*

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attention: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: PETER KINNAIRD Signature: P R *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 19 AINSWORTH ST Suburb: LEICHHARDT Postcode 2040

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

⇒ Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

⇒ Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.

⇒ I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.

⇒ Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.

⇒ There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

⇒ The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

⇒ The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it.This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: P KINNAIRD

Signature: P Kinnaird

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 19 AINSWORTH ST

Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode 2040

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I. The EIS at 7-51 refers to concerns that were raised by the community that the alignment of tunnels in Newtown appeared to go to the east of King Street, an area that had had no geotech drilling or testing. SMC staff indicated at Community information sessions that the maps included in the Concept Design were broad and indicative only, and that further details would be available in the EIS. No further details have been provided. This casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process

II. The EIS at 7-41 acknowledges that there is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will be made a 24 hour clearway, stating "Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street". This statement is deliberately misleading - it infers that SMC has authority in controlling impacts on regional roads. Roads and Maritime have the unfettered right to declare Clearways wherever and whenever they wish, and RMS has **NEVER** stated publicly that King Street will not be subject to extended clearway.

III. Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex, yet there are no detailed construction plans. It is not enough to say there will be mitigation if negative impacts unfold. An EIS should assess risks and be able to predict whether they are worth risking and if so, what mitigation should be necessary.

IV. It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The EIS Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.

V. Increased traffic congestion in areas around portals will increase pollution along roadsides, with predicted adverse impacts on breathing and through long-term carcinogenic effects. The maps and analysis of the pollution effects in the EIS should be presented in a way that enables them to be understood by ordinary citizens. Instead information is presented in a way that is deliberately obscure and hard to interpret.

VI. EIS is Indicative only - The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' The community will have no opportunity to comment on the Preferred Infrastructure Report which forms the basis of the approval conditions. This means the community will have limited say in the management of the impacts identified in the EIS. The EIS needs to provide an opportunity for the community to meaningfully input into this report and approval conditions.

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** P H R Kinnaird
	Address: 19 Ainsworth St
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Leichhardt **Postcode** 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:** Peter Kinnaird
Please Include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The EIS admits that air pollutants will exceed permitted levels along the Canal Rd used to access the St Peters Interchange because the traffic will be heavier. This is an unacceptable impact which will adversely affect vehicle users because it is known that people in their vehicles are not protected from the air pollution, as well as anyone on foot or cycling in the streets around the interchange. No amelioration is offered.

- The EIS states that traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange is expected to be worse after completion of the M5 and the M4-M5 Link particularly in the evening peak hour. The EIS admits that this will have a "moderate negative" impact on the neighbourhood in increasing pollution (also admitted separately) therefore in health impacts, on safety for foot and cycle traffic but also for vehicles and on the local amenity.

- The traffic around St Peters expected to be heavier because of the increased road access to the new Interchange will adversely affect our community because moving around to our parks and to the shops, to the buses and to the train stations, for pedestrians and cars, will be more difficult. Our community is being sacrificed for the marginal improvement in traffic movement elsewhere in Sydney. No measures to ameliorate the impact are mentioned. This is unacceptable.

- The EIS admits that the increased traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange will impact on bus running times especially in the evening peak hour and increase the time taken (2.5 minutes, which seems optimistic). The 422 bus and associated cross city services which use the Princes Highway are notorious for irregular running times because of the congestion on the Princes highway and cross roads, so an admitted worsening of the running time will adversely impact the people who are dependent on the buses. This will be compounded by the loss of train services at St Peters station while it is closed for the Sydney Metro build and then subsequently when it re-opens. In all the impact of the new M5 and the M4-M5 link is to worsen access to public transport significantly for the residents of the St Peters neighbourhood.

- It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** P KINNAIRD
	Address: 19 AINSWORTH ST
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** LILYFIELD **Postcode** 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:** P K
Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The volume of extra heavy traffic in the Rozelle area and the acknowledged impact this will have on local roads is completely unacceptable to me.

- The social and economic impact study fails to record the great concern for valued Newtown heritage

- The EIS identifies hundreds of negative impacts of the project but always states that they will be manageable or acceptable even if negative. This shows the inherent bias in the EIS process.

- The consultants for the Social and Economic Impact study is HillPDA. This company has a conflict of interest and is not an appropriate choice to do a social impact study of WestCONnex. Amongst its services it offers property valuation services and promotes property development in what are perceived to be strategic locations. HillPDA were heavily involved in work leading to the development of Urban Growth NSW and the heavily criticised Parramatta Rd Study. It is not in the public interest to use public funds on an EIS done by a company that has such a heavy stake in property development opportunities along the Parramatta Rd corridor. One of the advantages of property development along Parramatta Rd that Hill PDA promotes on its website is the 33 kilometre WestCONnex.

- The EIS acknowledges that extra construction traffic will add to travel times across the Inner West and have a negative impact on businesses in the area. No compensation is suggested. These impacts are not been taken into account of evaluating the cost of WestCONnex.

- The EIS acknowledges that 'rat running' by cars to avoid added congestion and delays caused by construction traffic will put residents at risk. No only solution is a Management Plan, which is yet to be developed, and to which the public will have no impact. This is completely unacceptable.

- The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.

- Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downgrades the concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. It also does not mention concerns about heritage impacts in Newtown. I can only assume that this is because there was almost no consultation in Newtown and a failure to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters.

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Lisa Stower **Address:** 10 Ainsworth St
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Ashfield **Postcode** 2131
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

i. 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

ii. There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

iii. 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

iv. 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

v. I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents.NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** [illegible]
	Address: 19 Ainsworth St
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** [illegible] **Postcode** 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**
Please Include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

A. Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.

B. Why are two different options being suggested for Haberfield? It is clear that both of these are unacceptable and will expose residents to unnecessary traffic danger, congestion and disruption with capacity to enjoy their homes and environment. It is insulting that the EIS acknowledges this but offers not solution other than to go ahead.

C. I do not consider so many disruptions of pedestrian and cycle ways to be a 'temporary' impact. Four years in the life of a community is a long time. The EIS acknowledges that there will be more danger in the environment around construction sites. It is a serious matter to deliberately take steps to reduce the safety of a community, especially when as the traffic analysis shows there will be a legacy of traffic congestion even in 2033. A promise of a plan is NOT an answer to those concerned about the impacts.

D. The impact of the project on cycling and walking will be considerable around construction sites. The promise of a construction plan is not sufficient. There has not been sufficient consultation or warning given to those directly affected or interested organisations. There needs to be a longer period of consultation so that the community can be informed about the added dangers and inconvenience, especially when you consider that it is over a 4 year period.

E. Rozelle is an old and historic suburbs of Sydney. The damage that this project would do in destruction of homes, other buildings and vegetation is unacceptable, especially when the project would leave a legacy of traffic congestion in the area.

F. It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area, Rozelle

G. Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.

H. A lot of work has gone into building cycling and pedestrian routes in Rozelle and Annandale. Interference and disruption of routes for four years is not a 'temporary' imposition.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Lisa Solomon Address: 19 Ainsworth St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Wyfood Postcode 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

a. I am appalled to learn that more than 100 homes including hundreds of residents will be affected by noise exceedences 'out of hours' in the vicinity of Darley Road, Leichhardt. This will not just be for a few days but could continue for years. Such impacts will severely impact on the quality of life of residents.

b. I am appalled to read in the EIS that more than 100 homes across the Rozelle construction sites will be severely affected by construction noise for months or even years at a time. This would include hundreds of individual residents including young children, school students and people who spend time at home during the day. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should not give approval to a project that could cause such impacts. Promises of potential mitigation are not enough, especially when you consider the ongoing unacceptable noise in Haberfield during the M4East construction.

c. Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)

d. Daytime noise at 177 properties across the project is predicted to be so bad during the years of construction that extra noise treatments will be required. The is however a caveat – the properties will change if the design changes. My understanding is that the design could change without the public being specifically notified or given the chance for feedback. This means that there is a possibility of hundreds of residents being severely impacted who are not even identified in this EIS. I find this completely unacceptable.

e. I do not accept the finding in the Appendix P that there will be no noise exceedences during construction at Campbell Rd St Peters. There has been terrible noise during the early construction of the New M5. Why would this stop, especially given the construction is just as close to houses? Is it because the noise is already so bad that comparatively it will not be that much worse. This casts doubt on the whole noise study.

f. I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

Attention Director **Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,** **Department of Planning and Environment** **GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001**	**Name:** Kiran Dhamoon
	Address: 19 ainsworth Street
Application Number: SSI 7485	**Suburb:** Leichardt **Postcode** 2040
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	**Signature:**
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration: I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.**	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

- The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.
- In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.
- The RMS has previously identified the Darley Rd site in Leichhardt as the third most dangerous traffic hazard in the Inner West. The NSW Land and Environment Court found that the location of the site couldn't safely deal with 60 bottle truck movements a week, but the M4/M5 EIS shows that more than 800 vehicles including hundreds of heavy ones will use the site each day as part of construction of M4M5 Link. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why are the already acknowledged impacts being ignored.
- It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.
- The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.
- EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attention: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Name: Sophie Hardy Signature: *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 77 Piper Street Suburb: Lilyfield Postcode 2040

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application

- *It is outrageous to suggest that four unfiltered stacks would be built in one area in Rozelle*
- *The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement may occur. We object to the project in its entirety on this basis. The EIS states that 'settlement, induced by tunnel excavation, and groundwater drawdown, may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment'. The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres. However, some tunnelling is at less than 10 metres. This proposed tunnel alignment creates an unacceptable risk of ground movement. In addition, the EIS states that there are a number of discrete areas to the north and northwest of the Rozelle Rail Yards, to the north of Campbell Road at St Peters and in the vicinity of Lord Street at Newtown where ground water movement above 20 milliliters is predicted 'strict limits on the degree of settlement permitted would be imposed on the project" and 'damage' would be rectified at no cost to the owner. would be placed (Executive Summary, xvii -iii). The project should not be permitted to be delivered in such a way that there is a known risk to property damage that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level of risk.*
- *It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.*
- *The EIS refers to be construction impacts as being 'temporary'. I do not consider a five year construction period to be temporary.*
- *I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.*
- *I do not consider it acceptable that cycling /pedestrian routes should be changed for four years in Annandale and Rozelle in ways that will make cycling more difficult and walking less possible for residents with reduced mobility. These are vital community transport routes.*
- *602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective.*

Submission to: Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment. GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW,2001

Attention Director — Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: SOPHIE HAKOY

Signature:

Please include/delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
Declaration: I have not made any reportable donations in the last two years.

Address: 77 PIPER STREET

Suburb: LILYFIELD Postcode: 2040

I wish to register my strong objections to Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link). My reasons are set out below:

REASONS FOR WESTCONNEX

1.The main reason given for the construction of the WestConnex motorway is to connect to Sydney Airport and Port Botany. The project has failed to meet both of these objectives.

TRAVEL TIME SAVED?

2. If stage 3 of the Westconnex project is completed, it is predicted that by 2033, reductions in peak travel times from Western Sydney to the airport area and to the Botany Port area will be **miniscule**. Parramatta to Sydney airport area will save **10 minutes**, between Burwood and Sydney Airport the time saved will **be 5 minutes** and between Silverwater and Port Botany the time saved will **be 10 minutes.** These are only the best predictions put forward and time savings may in fact be much less. The whole rationale for building this wasteful **18 billion dollar** polluting project was precisely for that reason... to reduce travel times and to connect with Port Botany and the Airport.

SUBSIDENCE AND HOUSE DAMAGE

3.The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of **ground movement and subsidence is lessened** where tunnelling is more than **35 metres underground**. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg **John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 2 7 metres.(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1)**. At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

HEALTH DANGERS

4. It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With massive number of extra truck **four unfiltered emissions stacks** in the area plus a **large number of exit portals,** the residents of this area will suffer greatly from **poisonous diesel particulates.** This is negligent when you consider that, the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared **diesel particulates carcinogenic**. " As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."

CAR PARKING CONGESTION

5.Rozelle Rail Yards will have **400 car** parking spaces provided for workers(EIS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately **550.** This means **that 150 vehicles** will need to **park in nearby local streets** which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.

AIR AND NOISE POLLUTION

6. Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience **increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution**— most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe and in Victoria street and its surrounds in Rozelle. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a **massive number of extra truck movements** and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times. Also, the widening of the Crescent between the city West Link and Johnston street with **an extra lane being constructed** will lead to heavy traffic congestion on a road that has **3 Primary/Infants schools**. In Rozelle work will take place as close as 250 metres from the Rozelle Primary School when construction of the Iron

Cove Link tunnel entrances and exits on Victoria Road take place. In fact, Anzac Bridge is **currently at maximum** capacity during peak hours.

Furthermore, the EIS states that the current Rozelle Interchange and surrounds of Anzac Bridge are presently close to full capacity. Modelling shows that the project will have significant impact on the area surrounding Rozelle Interchange. The Anzac Bridge will have 60% more traffic in 2033 and will be at full capacity in off peak times by2021.The interchanges at Victoria Rd and Darling St and Victoria Rd and Robert St will have become intolerable which means bus reliability and performance will be worsened.

With the proposed construction, the area is going to be subjected to a huge increase in vehicle movements throughout the 5 year construction period.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS

7.The removal of spoil from the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to **the largest number of spoil truck movements** on the entire Stage 3 project: **517 Heavy truck movements a day,** of which 46 are stated to take place during peak hours. This will lead to extra noise and air pollution in this area.

The **unacceptable noise levels** which will accompany the construction of this massive interchange will further add to the discomfort of the residents. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution which will adversely affect residents. The EIS actually states that local residents may have to keep their windows and doors closed to keep out the noise and dust. The proposed work hours for construction in the Goods Yard for the tunneling and spoil removal are 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This could lead to loss of sleep for local residents as well as loss of lifestyle.

There will also be disturbance of soil in the old Rozelle Goods Yard which may be thick with toxic contaminants such as **lead and asbestos**(as was the case in St Peters.) You made no provision for the safe removal of these toxic substances in St Peters and I do not see any provision in the EIS for their safe removal in this area.

LOSS OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

8. The removal of Buruwan Park between The Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Parade, Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a direct loss of much-needed parkland in this inner city area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a **major cycle route** from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, IJTS and the CBD.

PROPOSED PARK

9.The proposed building of a park in the area of the Goods Yard right in the middle of a large number of exit portals and **poisonous smoke stacks** borders on being criminally negligent. This new **''recreational area' will** be subject to the dangerous invisible particulates of 2.5 microns and smaller so many residents and children will be unaware that they are being poisoned. **All evidence shows that these particulates are linked with increased cases of asthma, lung disease, cancer and stroke** placing further pressure on our already overloaded health system.

RESIDENT CONSULTATION

10. Although the EIS indicates what is to be expected when construction begins, it also states that that only after Construction Contractors have been engaged would project designs and methodologies be finally worked out and agreed upon. This may result in major **changes to the project design and construction methodologies**. The community would have **no say in this process**!

CHANGE OF PLANS?

11. In the introduction of the EIS it clearly states that the information in the EIS is 'indicative of the final design' only. The reality of this statement means that the project may be completely different to stated plans in the EIS.

OTHER IMPACTS TO CONSIDER

13. The Sydney Metro West project which is Sydney's next big railway infrastructure investment is not included in the Cumulative Impact Assessment! A **business case for the Metro** should be completed **before a decision** is taken on the Stage 3 project as it may be significantly impacted by the Metro.

The Inner City Regional Bike Network has also **not been included** in the projects assessed under 'Cumulative Impacts'. It is identified by Infrastructure Australia as a 'Priority Initiative' and therefore must be included.

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Sophie Hardy

Signature:

*Please **Include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 74 Piper Street

Suburb: Lilyfield Postcode 2040

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The EIS states that 'Impacts associated with property acquisition would be managed through a property acquisition support service.' There is no reference as to how this support service will be more effective than that currently offered. There were many upset residents and businesses who did not believe they were treated in a respectful and fair manner in earlier stages. The EIS needs to include details as to lessons learned from earlier projects and how this will be improved for the M4-M5 impacted residents and businesses. (Executive Summary xviii)

- I object to the publication of this EIS only 14 days after the final date for submission of comments on the concept design. At the time this EIS was approved for publication, there had been no public response to the public submissions on the design. It was not possible that the community's feedback was considered let alone assessed before the EIS model was finalised. The rushed process exposes the fundamental lack of integrity in the feedback process and treats the community with contempt.

- At very minimum, the assessment of Strategic Alternative 1 (improvements to the existing arterial road network) should:

- Identify key network capacity issues.
- Develop a scenario of investments in (potentially major) arterial road improvements required to address the road network capacity constraints. The City of Sydney's alternative scheme provides one example of what improvements to the existing arterial road network might look like.

- Carry out transport modelling and economic analysis to inform the assessment of the alternative.

- The removal of Buruwan Park between The Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Parade, Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a direct loss of much-needed parkland in this inner city area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a major cycle route from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD.

- I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.

- It is quite clear that the escalating cost of tolls will encourage drivers to avoid tollways. This will further pollute and congest local roads. Such impact already evident on Parramatta Rd usage after the new M4 tolls were introduced. The community expects similar impacts on roads around the St Peters interchange, including the Princes Highway, King St, Enmore and Edgeware Roads and though streets of Alexandria and Erskineville. The EIS Traffic analysis fails to deal with this issue of traffic beyond the boundaries of the project and should be rejected.

- The presence of 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day at this site will create an unacceptable risk to students. The EIS should not BE APPROVED!

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name: Sherdai De Giorgio Signature: S. De Giorgio *Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website* ***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.* Address: 12 Muttagong St Suburb: Enmore Postcode 4051	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 Attn: Director – Transport Assessments Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I submit this objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the following reasons, and ask that the Minister reject the application.

a. The EIS uses the term 'construction fatigue' to refer to the continuing impacts of construction. In St Peters construction work in relation to the M4 and M5 has been going on for years. Approval of this latest EIS will mean that construction impacts of M4 and New M5 will extend for a further five years with both construction and 24/7 tunnelling sites. In reality 'construction fatigue' means residents in St Peters losing homes and neighbours and community; roadworks physically dividing communities; sickening odours over several months, incredible noise pollution 24 hours a day and dangerous work practices putting community members at risk. These conditions have already placed enormous stress on local residents, seriously impacting health and well-being. Another 5 years will be breaking point for many residents. How is this addressed in the EIS beyond the acknowledgement of 'construction fatigue'. This is intolerable for the local community who bear the greatest cost of the construction of the M4 and M5 and the least benefit.

b. In Leichhardt serious safety concerns about the choice of the Darley Rd site have been raised by the Inner West Council and an independent engineer's report. Despite countless meetings between local residents and SMC and RMS over 12 months, none of the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents have even been acknowledged. This is a massive breach of community trust and seriously questions the integrity of the EIS.

c. The RMS has previously identified the Darley Rd site in Leichhardt as the third most dangerous traffic hazard in the Inner West. The NSW Land and Environment Court found that the location of the site couldn't safely deal with 60 bottle truck movements a week, but the M4/M5 EIS shows that more than 800 vehicles including hundreds of heavy ones will use the site each day as part of construction of M4M5 Link. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why are the already acknowledged impacts being ignored.

d. It has estimated that if construction goes ahead, some homes in Darley St Leichhardt will have a truck on average every 4 minutes just metres from their bedrooms. If experience in Haberfield, Kingsgrove, St Peters and Alexandria is anything to go by, residents can again expect the actual experience to be worse than predicted by the EIS. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE? why have the serious and legitimate concerns raised by the residents not even been acknowledged.

e. The EIS identifies hundreds of risks at different construction sites. It relation to these risks the EIS recommends proceeding despite the risks; or seeking a way to mitigate risks during the "detailed design" phase. That phase excludes the public altogether. That is, the M4/M5 should be approved with no calculation of risks or what mitigation may mean for impacted residents.

f. EIS social impact study states that "the health and safety of residents should be prioritised around construction areas" - this is merely platitudinous in the light of the choice of Darley Rd the third most dangerous traffic intersection in the Inner West as a construction site.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: MAX LEAT INGE

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website

***Declaration** : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 6/169 LIVING STONE ROAD

Suburb: MARRICKVILLE Postcode 2204.

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director - Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

a. The EIS contains no detail of the access tunnel from the Darley Road site to the mainline tunnel other than depicting the route. The approval conditions need to ensure that tunnelling is occurring at sufficient depth so as to not jeopardise the integrity of the homes and not create unacceptable vibration and noise impacts for James Street residents and those at adjacent streets. The approval conditions need to make clear the period of time for which the 'temporary' tunnel is to be used.

b. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur. It states that subsidence may occur along tunnel paths due to tunnel excavation and water drawdown. The risk of ground movement and subsidence is greater where tunnels are less than 35 metres underground. The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels in that area which are a great deal less than 35metres. The same is true for areas of Rozelle where layers of tunnels are proposed. This will definitely lead to structural damage and cracking to homes above. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage. This is not acceptable

c. The proposed work hours for the Rozelle Rail Yards Site are tunnelling and spoil handling 24 hours a day seven days a week. On ground construction Mon-Fri 7.00am - 6.00pm, Sat 8.00am-1.00pm. However as has been experienced by those at Haberfield and St Peters these hours and especially late and night work have been extended and implemented when the schedules have fallen behind and this has lead to great physical and mental stress for many residents through interrupted sleep and loss of sleep especially for those with children. The roads and sites at night in the area will see a marked increase in noise from truck movements, truck reversing alarms and running machinery. It will also see a marked increase in light during the night hours with site illumination and vehicle head lights as has been experienced in other areas. These problems have not been addressed in the EIS.

d. Heritage items - Camperdown. The EIS also acknowledges that the use of a rock-breaker at the outer extents of the project footprint will affect 73 residences, with five heritage items identified as having the potential to be within the 'minimum safe working distance'. While some mitigation 'considered', it is not mandated and the requirement to mitigate is limited to 'where feasible and reasonable'. The mitigation proposed seems in any event to comprise letter-boxing residents about the likely impacts! The protection of heritage items should be mandated, not just considered and there should be a strict requirement to protect such heritage items.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: MAX MCATEER

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 6/ 169 LIVINGSTONE ROAD

Suburb: MARRICKVILLE Postcode 2204

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

(1) Flooding – Leichhardt. Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.

(2) The substation and water treatment plant should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link. This will mean that the site is less visible to residents and most pedestrian access is at this end. There are no homes that will have direct line of site of the facility if it is moved. This will also enable direct pedestrian access to the light rail without the need to use the winding path at the rear of the site which creates safety issues and adds to the time required to access the light rail stop.

(3) 1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

(4) I oppose the destruction of any more of Sydney's heritage for WestCONnex. I am appalled that Sydney Motorway Corporation is seeking approval to tunnel under hundreds of highly valued heritage buildings in Newtown without any serious assessment of risk at all. This heritage belongs to all of Sydney.

(5) I am completely opposed to approving a project in which the Air quality experts recommend rather than filtrating stacks extra stacks could be added later.

(6) The EIS was prepared by global engineering firm AECOM, which also prepared the EIS for Stages 1 and 2. When he approved these earlier stages, the then Minister for Planning Rob Stokes pointed to conditions of approval that would minimise impacts on communities. But the impacts have turned out to worse than expected.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I submit my strongest objections to the M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, and request the Minister to reject the application and require SMC / RMS to issue a true, not an 'indicative' and fundamentally flawed EIS

Name: GRACE MITCHELL

Signature: Grace Mitchell

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 316 WILLIAMS PDE

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The Health costs of outdoor Air Pollution in Australia are up to $8.4 Billion a year. The Health costs of Particulate Pollution in the Sydney Greater Metropolitan area is around $4.7 Billion a year. With no filtration on the Westconnex tunnels these Health costs will rise substantially.

- I am concerned that while hundreds of impacts on resident, including noise, loss of business, dust, and lost time through more traffic congestion, are identified in the EIS, the approach is always to recommend approval and promise vague 'mitigation' in the future. This is not good enough.

- Flooding – Leichhardt. Darley Road and adjacent streets such as Hubert St are exposed to flood. The flood impact could be exacerbated by the disruption or blockage of existing drainage networks, which are risks identified in the EIS. The EIS has not assessed whether the identified risk to the existing drainage network will cause increased risk of flood damage to flood lots and it fails to take account of the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan which contains recommended flood modification options. The EIS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede the Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM3 to lay additional pipes/culverts from Elswick Street to Hawthorne Canal (via Regent Street and Darley Road). RMS has not assessed whether its drainage infrastructure will impede Inner West Council's Leichhardt Floodplain Risk Management Plan option HC_FM4 to lay additional pipes/ culverts from William Street to Hawthorne Canal via Hubert Street and Darley Road. The EIS should not be approved as it has not properly explained or assessed these impacts.

- The removal of Buruwan Park between the Crescent and Bayview Crescent/Railway Pde Annandale to accommodate the widening realignment of the Crescent would be a particular loss of badly needed parkland in this Inner City area. Currently we have fewer parks than almost any suburb in Sydney so this would have a direct impact on local people. Buruwan Park also lies on a major cycle route from Railway Pde through to Anzac Bridge, UTS and the CBD. The alternative route being suggested is poor and takes no real account of trying to encourage cycling as a mode of transport. Cycling should be made as easy as possible to get more ordinary commuters to bicycle and the alternative to the current level route directs cyclists to Johnston St and then up Bayview Crescent arguably the steepest road in Annandale.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Ben Harris
	Address: 122 Burfitt St.
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Wahroonga Postcode 2076
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:
Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.	

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons:

1. The EIS admits that air pollutants will exceed permitted levels along the Canal Rd used to access the St Peters Interchange because the traffic will be heavier. This is an unacceptable impact which will adversely affect vehicle users because it is known that people in their vehicles are not protected from the air pollution, as well as anyone on foot or cycling in the streets around the interchange. No amelioration is offered.

2. The EIS states that traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange is expected to be worse after completion of the M5 and the M4-M5 Link particularly in the evening peak hour. The EIS admits that this will have a "moderate negative" impact on the neighbourhood in increasing pollution (also admitted separately) therefore in health impacts, on safety for foot and cycle traffic but also for vehicles and on the local amenity.

3. The traffic around St Peters expected to be heavier because of the increased road access to the new Interchange will adversely affect our community because moving around to our parks and to the shops, to the buses and to the train stations, for pedestrians and cars, will be more difficult. Our community is being sacrificed for the marginal improvement in traffic movement elsewhere in Sydney. No measures to ameliorate the impact are mentioned. This is unacceptable.

4. The EIS admits that the increased traffic congestion around the St Peters Interchange will impact on bus running times especially in the evening peak hour and increase the time taken (2.5 minutes, which seems optimistic). The 422 bus and associated cross city services which use the Princes Highway are notorious for irregular running times because of the congestion on the Princes highway and cross roads, so an admitted worsening of the running time will adversely impact the people who are dependent on the buses. This will be compounded by the loss of train services at St Peters station while it is closed for the Sydney Metro build and then subsequently when it re-opens. In all the impact of the new M5 and the M4-M5 link is to worsen access to public transport significantly for the residents of the St Peters neighbourhood.

5. It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Ben Hann

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 122 Burwood St

Suburb: Walworth *Postcode* 2204

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

A. The social and economic impact study notes the high value placed on community networks and social inclusion but does nothing to seriously evaluate the social impacts on these of WestCONnex. Any genuine assessment would draw on experience with the New M5 and M4 East rather than ignoring it.This lack of genuine engagement with social impact reduces the study to the level of a demographic description and a series of bland value statement

B. The EIS states that spoil haulage hours will be restricted but ignores the fact that the same was promised for the M4 East but these promises have been ignored repeatedly.

C. The EIS states "Direct and indirect traffic disruptions are likely to be experienced on local and arterial roads in most suburbs that are in close proximity to construction sites. This would include the suburbs of Ashfield, Haberfield, St Peters, Camperdown, Annandale, Lilyfield, Leichhardt, and Rozelle." Despite this finding, the study then pushes these negative impacts aside as inevitable. There is never any evaluation of whether in the light of the negative impacts an alternative public infrastructure project might be preferable.

D. The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

E. It is clear from reading the EIS that the impacts of the project on traffic congestion and travel times across the region during five years of construction will be negative and substantial. Five years is a long time. At the end of the day, the result of the project will also be more traffic congestion although not necessarily in the same places as now. There needs to be a serious cost benefit analysis before the project proceeds further.

F. Table 6.1 in Appendix Q (Social and Economic impact) is not an accurate report on the concerns of residents. It downplays concerns of Newtown, St Peters and Haberfield residents. It does not even mention concerns about additional years of construction in Haberfield and St Peters. The raises the question of whether this is a result of the failure of SMC to notify impacted residents including those on the Eastern Side of King Street and St Peters about the potential impacts of the M4 M5

G. The EIS identifies a risk to children from construction traffic at Haberfield School. I find such risks unacceptable and am not satisfied with a promise of a Plan to which the public is excluding from viewing or providing feedback until it is published.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Nikita Woods

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 13 st peters, st peters

Suburb: St peters *Postcode* 2042

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- 1.1599 residences or thousands of residents would have noise levels in the evening sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The technical paper in EIS acknowledges that this is the case, even allowing for acoustic sheds and noise walls. Sleep disturbance has health risks including heightened stress levels and risk of developing dementia. This is simply not acceptable.

- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

- 371 homes and hundreds of residences near the Darley Rd construction site will be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance. The EIS promises negotiation over mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. On other projects those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. There is no certainty in any case that additional measures would be taken or be effective. This is another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- 602 homes and more than a thousand residents near Rozelle construction sites would be affected by noise sufficient to cause sleep disturbance even if acoustic sheds and noise walls are used..The EIS promises negotiation to provide even more mitigation on a one by one basis. This is not acceptable to me. As other projects have demonstrated, those with less bargaining power or social networks have been left more exposed. In any case, there is no certainty that additional measures would be taken or be effective. Experience on the New M5 has shown that residents who are affected badly by noise are being refused assistance on the basis that an unknown consultant does not consider them to be sufficiently affected. Night time noise is therefore another unacceptable impact of this project and reason why it should be opposed.

- I am very concerned by the finding that 162 homes and hundreds of individual residents including young children, students and people at home during the day will be highly affected by construction noise. These homes are spread across all construction sites. The predicted levels are more than 75 decibels and high enough to produce damage over an eight hour period. Such noise levels will severely impact on the health, capacity to work and quality of life of residents.NSW Planning should not give approval for this, especially based on the difficulties residents near M4 East, M4 Widening and New M5 residents have experienced in achieving notification and mitigation M4 east and New M5. A promise of some future plan to mitigate by a construction company yet to be nominated is certainly not sufficient.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Natalia Organn Savor

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 126 Cavendish Street

Suburb: Stanmore Postcode 2048

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

a) Increased traffic on local roads will decrease residential amenity and decrease the potential for new higher density housing. This will affect numerous streets, with particularly major impacts on The Crescent, Minogue Crescent, Ross, Mount Vernon, Catherine, Ross and Arundel streets in Glebe; and Euston Road, McEvoy, Botany, Wyndham, Bourke and Lachlan Streets in the Green Square area. In the redevelopment areas, land adjoining these streets may suffer a loss of development potential, a loss of value and will bear the additional costs of designing for noisy environments.

b) The EIS admits that the people who live in western Sydney have lower incomes than in the inner suburbs and that the tolls will therefore be a heavier cost in Emu Plains, Penrith, Mt Druitt, Blacktown or Wetherill Park than in Strathfield or Padstow. This is unfair when the benefits of Stage 3 are all for north-south connections to the northern beaches or the proposed new harbour tunnel.

c) The EIS provides traffic projections for the 'With Project' scenario and 'cumulative' scenario (which in addition to links in the 'With Project' scenario includes the Beaches Link and F6 motorway connections), but when referencing the traffic benefits/impacts in the early sections, the EIS appears to cite the 'with project' scenario rather than Cumulative Scenario. It is unclear which scenarios the Business Case best reflects.

d) The modelling makes no mention of bus lanes on Victoria Rd. If these lanes were not modelled as car lanes the assumed capacity of the road is incorrect.

e) The high tolls are set to increase for decades by the CPI or by 4% a year, whichever is higher. When inflation is low and wages are not even keeping up with low inflation this is outrageous. And it is not as if the commuters or workers of western Sydney have a real alternative in public transport. This is just gouging western Sydney road users to make the road attractive to a buyer

f) The EIS admits that drivers from lower income households are more likely to travel longer distances to avoid tolls because of the cost. So you either pay the high tolls (capped at $7.95 in 2015 dollars) or you drive for longer to avoid the tolls. We have seen this already where commuters have chose to drive on Parramatta rd not the new M4 with the new tolls. This is unfair.

g) The 2023 'cumulative' modelling scenario includes the Sydney Gateway and the western harbour tunnel but neither of these projects are currently committed and it is highly unlikely they will be completed by this date. This raises the question of why did the proponent adopt such a misleading position and how does it affect the impacts stated?

h) This EIS contains no meaningful design and construction details and no parameters as to how broad changes and therefore impacts could be. It therefore fails to allow the community to be informed about and comment on the project impacts in a meaningful way.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name:
WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Natalia Ongwen Cavor

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 126 Cavendish Street

Suburb: Stanmore Postcode 2048

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application, and require SMC and RMC to prepare a new EIS that is based on genuine, not indicative, design parameters, costings, and business case.

a) This EIS treats the public with contempt. It offers no final design, no commitment to an outcome and only the most vague and unreliable traffic modelling. It seeks to get NSW Government approval so that the opportunity to design, build, operate, maintain and toll the road can be sold to private investors, completely outside of the view of the public who will bear the effects on their community for the next 100 years. This is a continuation of the appalling disregard for transparency and disregard of the population that bears the brunt of the WestConnex traffic impacts. It displays a lack of understanding of contemporary good practice in transport problem resolution.

b) At the Rozelle Rail Yards site there will be 2 entry/exits for Heavy vehicles off the City West Link. Extra traffic controls are to be set up with extra sequences of traffic light controls to enable spoil trucks to access and exit this site. It is stated there will be 517 Heavy Truck movements as day of which 46 will be in Peak hours, plus 10 truck movements from the Crescent site. Maps showing the truck movements show that all these trucks will use the City West link. Similar maps for Darley Rd dive site also show trucks from there using the City West Link. At a consultation with a Westconnex staff member it was stated that trucks removing spoil from Camperdown dive site would be stationed and called up from James Craig Rd, so there will also be a constant movement of trucks from this location onto the City West Link. The EIS states the cumulative effect of truck movements from all sites onto the City West Link will be 700 one way Heavy truck movements a day and of that 208 will be in Peak hours. This will cause total gridlock. The EIS says other routes maybe considered; there are no details of these. This is unacceptable as it would allow a privately owned SMC to make whatever decisions they saw fit when and if the EIS is approved with no input from the community allowed.

c) The impacts on The Crescent and Annandale are massive and were not sufficiently revealed in the Concept Design to enable residents to give feedback on the negative impacts on communities and businesses in the area.

d) It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With four unfiltered emissions stacks in the area plus a large number of exit portals, the residents of this area will suffer greatly from poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that, the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic. " As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: KIERAN MURPHY

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 19 PARK RD

Suburb: EAST HILLS Postcode 2213

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- The Project will have significant impacts on the streets near on- and off-ramps. Modelling shows that the Anzac Bridge will have 60% more traffic in 2033 because of the Project.

- The modelling assuming journey time shifting when mode shifting is more likely.

- The modelling does not consider the latest plans from the NSW Government's Greater Sydney Commission despite them being released nine months ago.

- I object to the whole project because the people of Western Sydney were not consulted about where they wanted new roads or what transport they prefer. The WestConnex project with the tolls we will have to pay was just dumped on us, there was no consultation about our needs.

- The management of water in the Rozelle Yards is of great concern as the site is highly contaminated and the construction work that will be carried out will cause a great deal of disturbance especially once vegetation has been removed. There will be potential impacts from contaminated soils, leakage/spills of hydrocarbons and other chemicals from machinery, vehicles transporting spoil adjacent to roads and stormwaters, rinse water from plant washing and concrete slurries. Water from tunnelling activity and other works will also introduce contaminants. The EIS says that much of this water will be treated in temporary treatment facilities and sediment tanks before being released to Whites Creek and Rozelle Bay. The EIS does not disclose what levels of pollution controls will be implemented to make sure that contaminated water is not released into White's Creek or Rozelle Bay. This is not acceptable.

- The project directly affected five listed heritage items, including demolition of the stormwater canal at Rozelle. Twenty-one other statutory heritage items of State or local heritage significant would be subject to indirect impacts through vibration, settlement and visual setting. And directly affected nine individual buildings as assessed as being potential local heritage items. It is unacceptable that heritage items are removed or potentially damaged and the approval should prohibit such destruction.(Executive Summary xviii)

- Residents of Haberfield should not be asked to choose between two construction sites. This smacks of manipulation and a deliberate attempt to divide a community. Both choice extend construction impacts for four years and severely impact the quality of life of residents. NSW Planning should reject the impacts on Haberfield as unacceptable. (page 106)

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Iona Temple

Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 42 Edgware Rd

Suburb: Enmore Postcode 2042

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- 2 G Appendix P Table 5-27 of the EIS states that 43% of the Leichhardt- Glebe Precinct travel to work by Car, 21% by Bus and 5%by Rail. These are figures for 2011. These figures are being used to promote the project and suggest they are accurate today. In the case of Rail these figures are extremely questionable. The Light Rail is now hugely popular, it's use having grown enormously. It is travelling at full capacity at Peak hours. More services are being put in place. Apartment blocks are being built as close to the Light Rail corridor as possible. Residents see the Light Rail as an efficient, reliable and timely method of commuting to work. It is blatantly obvious that the Govt should be investing heavily in building and extending Light Rail, Metro and Rail. If this were pursued in a professional manner the necessity for trying to hoodwink the community into believing that Westconnex were needed would be totally unnecessary.

- Rozelle Rail Yards will have 400 car parking spaces provided for workers(EiS). The daily workforce for these sites is stated to be approximately 550. This means that 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.

- The EIS lacks sufficient focus on traffic congestion in the suburbs of Alexandria and Erskineville. Are these being ignored because they will be even more congested than currently.

- The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed. All possible mitigation should be included as a condition of approval. The EIS acknowledges that substantial above ground invasive works will be required to demolish the Dan Murphys building and establish the road. The EIS noise projections indicate that for 10 weeks residents will suffer unacceptable noise impacts. The EIS doeS not contain a plan to manage or mitigate this terrible impact. There is no detail as to which homes will be offered (if at all) temporary relocation; there are no details of any noise walls or what treatments will be provided to individual homes that are badly affected. The approval needs to contain detail as to how this unacceptable impact will be managed and minimised during the construction period and, in particular, during site establishment.

- I object to the selection of the Darley Road site on the basis that the works required (demolition and surface works) will create unacceptable and unbearable noise and vibration impacts for extended periods. The EIS indicates that at least 36 homes will basically be unliveable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.

- There is a higher than average number of shift workers in the Inner West. The EIS acknowledges that even allowing for mitigation measures such as acoustic sheds and noise walls, shift workers will be more vulnerable to impacts of years of construction work and will consequently be at risk of a loss of quality of life, loss of productivity and chronic mental and physical illness.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email_____Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: D'Arcy Bush

Signature:

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 14 Liverpool Street

Suburb: Paddington *Postcode* 2021

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

1. *The heritage impacts of WestCONnex Stage 3 need to be seen in the light of the appalling wholesale destruction that has already taken place in St Peters and Haberfield. Scores of houses and industrial buildings were torn down for tollways that will not solve traffic congestions. Always the cost of destruction is undervalued and the benefits of WestCONnex promoted. Whenever WestCONnex wants to tear down buildings or put them at risk it is backed by the EIS evaluation. This is not objective and it is not in the public interest.*

2. *I object strongly to AECOM's approach to heritage. The methodology used is simply to describe heritage. If it interrupts the project plans, it simply must be destroyed. This is not an assessment at all. Plans to salvage items do have value but this value should not be used as a carrot to justify the removal of buildings.*

3. *The EIS claims to have saved Blackmore Park and Easton Park, Rozelle, due to negative community feedback. I am concerned that this is a false claim and that this site was never really in contention due to other physical factors. I would like NSW Planning to investigate whether this claim is correct to have heeded the community is false or not.*

4. *There has never been any proper assessment of the cumulative impacts on heritage of the WestCONnex project. The loss of heritage in Concord, Haberfield and St Peters has been on a large scale and now the Stage 3 EIS shows that the M$/M5 tunnel would further add to this loss.*

5. *Heritage items - Camperdown. The EIS also acknowledges that the use of a rock-breaker at the outer extents of the project footprint will affect 73 residences, with five heritage items identified as having the potential to be within the 'minimum safe working distance'. While some mitigation 'considered', it is not mandated and the requirement to mitigate is limited to 'where feasible and reasonable'. The mitigation proposed seems in any event to comprise letter-boxing residents about the likely impacts! The protection of heritage items should be mandated, not just considered and there should be a strict requirement to protect such heritage items.*

6. *I object to the assessment of the removal of buildings, other rail infrastructure and vegetation on the Rozelle Railway Yards being done in advance of this EIS. The RMS environmental assessment process is not publicly accountable. These works were part of the WestConnex project and should have been assessed as part of Stage 3.*

***Campaign Mailing Lists** : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: DOROTHEA RATCLIFFE

Signature: D Ratcliffe

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 63 The Avenue

Suburb: Granville *Postcode* 2142

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

1. The EIS acknowledges that visual impacts will occur during construction. However it does not propose to address these negative impacts in the design of the project. This is unacceptable and the EIS needs to propose walls,, plant and perimeter treatments and other measures at appropriate locations to lessen the impact on visual amenity. (Executive Summary xviii)

2. It is obvious the NSW government is in a desperate rush to get planning approval for the M4/M5. It has only allowed 60 days for comment yet the M4/M5 project is the most expensive and complicated stage of WestConnex. Critically, it involves building three layers of underground tunnels under parts of Rozelle. Such tunnelling does not exist anywhere in the world and as yet there are no engineering plans for this complex construction. Approval depends on senior staff in NSW Planning compliantly agreeing to tick off on the EIS, as was done with the New M5 and the M4. This demonstrates a wanton disregard for the safety of the residents of Rozelle and those who will be using the tunnel. WHAT IS THE RUSH?

3. This EIS contains little or no meaningful design and construction detail. It appears to be a wish list not based on actual effects. Everything is indicative, 'would' not 'will', telling me nothing is actually 'known' for certain – and is certainly not included here.

4. Stage 3 is the most complex and expensive stage of WestConnex and the government is seeking approval, yet there are no detailed construction plans so we are not speaking to a real situation.

5. The Air quality data is confusing and is not presented in a form that the community can interpret. The lack of clarity leads to a suspicion that areas of concern are being covered up.

6. Motor vehicles account for 14% of Particulate Pollution of 2.5 microns and less in Australia. There is no safe level to exposure to particulate matter of 2.5 microns and less. Particulate matter is linked with Asthma, Lung Disease, Cancer and Stroke.

7. The widening of the Crescent between the City West link and Johnston St with an extra lane being constructed will lead to heavy traffic congestion. This will be exacerbated still further by extra traffic light control cycles being incorporated into the signaling at both Johnston St and at the City West Link, with the inclusion of an extra traffic light control 400m West from the Crescent / City West Link junction to manage the movement of large numbers of spoil trucks.

8. It is clear that Annandale, Glebe, Rozelle and Lilyfield will be exposed to unacceptable health risks. With four unfiltered emissions stacks in the area plus a large number of exit portals, the residents of this area will suffer greatly from poisonous diesel particulates. This is negligent when you consider that , the World Health Organisation in 2012 declared diesel particulates carcinogenic. " As you are no doubt aware there are at least 5 schools that will be in the orbit of these poisonous fumes and children and the elderly are most at risk to lung ailments. Your Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school."

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name _____ *Email* _____ *Mobile* _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Kate Richards

Signature: K Richards

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: Unit 55/38 Lodge Gdns

Suburb: Elizabeth Bay Postcode 2011

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

I. *Many homes around the Rozelle Rail Yards and the Crescent Civil site will be noise affected, some will be highly noise affected. The expected duration of the cumulative works is 120 weeks, almost 3 years, when noise impact will be significant so it is essential that maximum noise mitigation measures are put in place. However the EIS contains only vague details of how mitigation will be carried out. There is no requirement that measures will in fact be carried out to address noise impacts. The approval conditions need to contain specific noise mitigation measures, that can be mandated and enforced. Areas that will be particularly highly noise affected are Bayview Crescent and Railway Parade, the Northern end of Rail Yard site and sections of Lilyfield Rd, Hornsey St, Quirk St and Robert St. Given their proximity, receivers located along Lilyfield Rd between Victoria Road and Gordon St which overlook the Rozelle Yards are likely to experience the greatest construction noise impact within the whole Rozelle area.*

II. *The three Pollution Stacks in the Rozelle Rail yards are shown to be 38 meters high. This is a totally inappropriate location for these Pollution Stacks. The Rozelle Rail Yards are located in a valley. The Stacks will be on land that is approximately 3.5 meters above sea level. Balmain Road between Wharf Rd and Victoria Road is at an elevation of on average 37 meters. Orange Grove Primary School is at an elevation of 33.4 meters. Areas of Hornsey Rd Rozelle are at 28 meters. Around the junction of Annandale St and Weynton St in Annandale the height above sea level is 29meters. All these areas are in close proximity to these stacks. All the pollution being exhausted from these stacks will almost be on the same level as these locations and so will be blowing almost directly into these properties, especially in summer when many windows are open. This is not acceptable. In situations of no wind the pollution will accumulate in this valley area and make the surrounding area highly polluted. This is not acceptable. There are also at least 4 schools of Primary age children well within one kilometer of these Stacks. Young children are the most vulnerable to pollution related disease.*

III. *I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.*

IV. *2 G Appendix P Table 5-27 of the EIS states that 43% of the Leichhardt- Glebe Precinct travel to work by Car, 21% by Bus and 5%by Rail. These are figures for 2011. These figures are being used to promote the project and suggest they are accurate today. In the case of Rail these figures are extremely questionable. The Light Rail is now hugely popular, it's use having grown enormously. It is travelling at full capacity at Peak hours. More services are being put in place. Apartment blocks are being built as close to the Light Rail corridor as possible. Residents see the Light Rail as an efficient, reliable and timely method of commuting to work. It is blatantly obvious that the Govt should be investing heavily in building and extending Light Rail, Metro and Rail. If this were pursued in a professional manner the necessity for trying to hoodwink the community into believing that Westconnex were needed would be totally unnecessary.*

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director
Application Number: SSI 7485

Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

Name: Luke Smith

Signature: [signature]

Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.

Address: 28/21-69 Regent Street

Suburb: Redfern *Postcode* 2016

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals for the following reasons:

- The EIS needs to require that all workers are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads at the Darley Road site. This is justified because the site provides 11 car spacers for an estimated 100 workers a day on site. The project cannot be approved on this basis without a strict requirement on workers to use public transport or project provided transport and a prohibition needs to be in place against parking on local streets. The EIS needs to require that this restriction is included in all contracts and in the relevant approval documentation

- The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is clear from more detailed reading deep into the EIS (ie 12-57 Sydney Water Tunnels) that the alignment and depths of the tunnels may vary very significantly, after further survey work has been done and construction methodology determined by the construction contractor. The maps provided in the EIS are nothing more than 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.

- The EIS proposes that all trucks will arrive at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site from Haberfield and travel along Darley Road to the site, with a right-hand turn now permitted into James Street. The proposed route will result in a truck every 3-4 minutes for 5 years running directly by the small houses on Darley Road. These homes will not be habitable during the five-year construction period due to the unacceptable noise impacts. The truck noise will be worsened by their need to travel up a steep hill to return to the City West Link, so the noise impacts will affect not just those homes on or immediately adjacent to Darley Road.

- Experience has shown that construction and other plans by WestCONnex are often regarded as flexible instruments. Any action to remedy breaches depends on residents complaining and Planning staff having resources to follow up which is often not the case. I find it unacceptable that the EIS is written in a way that simply ignores problems with other stages of WestCONnex.

- The Darley Road site will not be returned after the project, with a substantial portion permanently housing a Motorways Operations facility which involves a substation and water treatment plant. This means that the residents will not be able to directly access the North Light rail Station from Darley Road but will have to traverse Canal Road and use the narrow path from the side. In addition the presence of this facility reduces the utility of this vital land which could be turned into a community facility. Over the past 12 months community representatives were repeatedly told that the land would be returned and this has not occurred. We also object to the location of this type of infrastructure in a neighbourhood setting.

- Rather than adding to pollution, the NSW government should be seeking ways to reduce emissions. It is not acceptable to argue that worsening pollution is not a problem simply because it is already bad.

Campaign Mailing Lists *: I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties*

Name [redacted] *Email* [redacted] *Mobile* [redacted]

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: James Brennahan Address: 5 Penrose St
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Lane Cove Postcode 2066
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS states that the project will improve connection to the Sydney Airport and Port Botany. It will not. The Premier herself has said that the Sydney Gateway does not form part of the WestConnex project. Without the Sydney Gateway, connections between WestConnex (St Peters Interchange) and Sydney Airport and Port Botany will be via congested surface roads in Botany and Mascot. As the connection is unresolved, it is impossible to determine the effect on demand of the unknown pricing regime that will apply to the Sydney Gateway, nor how much travel time will be incurred – which might actually negate the already marginal proposed travel time savings.

- It is quite clear to me that insufficient research has been done on the archeology of the Rozelle Railway yards. This could be a valuable archeology site. Why has an EIS been put forward without the necessary research being done to further identify potential remains? No project should be approved on the basis of such an inadequate level of research.

- The WestConnex program of works has been described as an integrated transport network solution. However, the role and interdependency with public transport and freight rail is not considered. The recent Government commitment to a Metro West requires a rethink on the need for WestConnex. Particularly as the WestConnex business case outlines a mode shift from public transport to the toll road as a benefit required to justify it economically.

- While WestConnex might integrate with the wider motorway network, no evidence is provided demonstrating that it integrates with the wider road network – let alone the broader transport and land use system. For example the EIS provides no information about changes in traffic volumes entering the Sydney CBD caused by WestConnex. RMS has only just commenced work to identify which roads fanning out from WestConnex portals will need to be upgraded to deliver large numbers of vehicles to and from the project. It is thereformpossible to form a properly informed understanding of the environmental impacts – the very purpose of the EIS.

- Ambient air quality - There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I wish to submit my objection to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485. The reasons for objecting are set out below.

Name: Aurora Heinrich

Signature: Aheinrich

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 9 Trafalgar St

Suburb: Enmore NSW Postcode 2042

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- Rozelle Interchange and surrounds will experience increased traffic with associated noise and air pollution– most particularly at the Crescent, Johnson St and Catherine St, Annandale/Lilyfield/Leichhardt and Ross Street, Glebe. These streets are already highly congested at peak times and with a massive number of extra truck movements and traffic associated with construction, these streets will become gridlocked during peak times.

- The EIS states that after the M4-M5 opens, that traffic on Darley Road will increase by 4%. There is no benefit in the overall project for residents. During construction westbound traffic will increase on Darley Road by 37%. This increase in traffic for a period of up to five years will make it hazardous to cross the road and access the light rail and travel to Blackmore oval, the bat run, the dog park and the Leichhardt pool. In addition, it will drastically increase both local traffic and outer area traffic at peak commute times. We therefore object to the location of this site based on the unacceptable traffic impacts it will have on road users and on residents.

- The EIS should not be approved as it does not contain any certainty for residents as to what is proposed and does not provide a basis on which the project can be approved. The EIS states 'the detail of the design and construction approach is indicative only based on a concept design and is subject to detailed design and construction planning to be undertaken by the successful contractors.' Therefore this entire process is a sham as the extent to which concerns are taken into account is not known as the contractor can simply make further changes. As the contractor is not bound to take into account community impacts outside of the strict requirements and as the contractor will be trying to deliver the project as quickly and cheaply as possible, it is likely that the additional measure proposed with respect to construction noise mitigation for (example) will not be adopted. The EIS should not be approved on the basis that it does not provide a reliable basis on which to base the approval documents. It does not provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide meaningful feedback in accordance with the legislative obligation of the Government to provide a consultation process because the designs are 'indicative' only and subject to change. Because of this the EIS is riddled with caveats and lacks clear obligations and requirements fn project delivery. The additional effect of this is that the community and other stakeholders such as the Council will be unable to undertake compliance activities as the conditions are simply too broad and lack any substantial detail.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

I object to the WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application # SSI 7485, for the reasons set out below.

Name: Stephan Suhl

Signature: S Suhl

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website **Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

Address: 14/36-66 Flora St

Suburb: Erskineville NSW ~~2043~~ Postcode 2043

Submission to:

Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001

Attn: Director – Transport Assessments

Application Number: SSI 7485

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

A. Permanent substation and water treatment plant - Residents on Darley Rd opposite the site and residents in Hubert St will have a direct line of site to the Motorway operation infrastructure. The resultant impact is a permanent degradation of the visual environment, is a loss of amenity and is detrimental to the community. This facility should not be permitted in this location and the EIS needs to demonstrate why it is required at this site. If approved, the facility should be moved to the north of the site out of line of site of residents. The residual land should be returned for community purposes, such as green space, with future commercial uses ruled out. If the community is forced to endure 5 years of severe disruptions due to this toll road, the compensation should, at the very least, result in the land being returned to the community as green space.

B. It is clear from the EIS that spoil truck movements will not be confined to the City West link. At a community consultation it was revealed that trucks removing spoil at Camperdown would very likely be travelling from the James Craig Rd area and in that case would be using the additional lane on the Crescent and then turning right up Johnston St. This is totally CONTRARY to what concerned residents had been promised would not happen. It is clear that any assurances given to the community in past consultations are totally disregarded without consultation later. This is unacceptable.

C. Heart disease will skyrocket due to air pollution caused by Westconnex bringing more cars into the Inner West says Paul Torzillo, Head of Respiratory medicine at Royal Prince Albert Hospital. Inner West Courier 23rd May 2017

D. The removal of spoil at the Rozelle Rail Yards will lead to the largest amount of Spoil truck movements on the entire Stage 3 project: 517 Heavy truck movements a day, of which 46 are stated to take place at Peak hours. There will also be 10 Heavy truck movements a day from the Crescent Civil Site. The sheer number of trucks on the road will lead to massive increases in congestion. Maps in the EIS have the spoil trucks going to and from these sites from the Haberfield direction on the City West Link. This is also the direction that is being proposed for spoil truck movements from Darley Rd which is said to have 100 Heavy truck movements a day. It is stated that the cumulative effect of truck movements from all sites on the City West Link will be 700 (one way) Heavy truck movements a day and of that 208 will be in Peak hours. This plan totally lacks credibility

E. The Concept Design was a woefully inadequate document totally devoid of any real depth of detail in terms of maps, scales, distances with only vague suggestions and glamorized Artist's Impressions of an idealized view of what Stage 3 would be like. It was another example of current city planning documents that consistently accentuate huge areas of tranquil green spaces with families and children out walking and riding bicycles in idealized parks and suburbs. All this is total PR spin and bears no reality about the real outcome of the build. It bears no reality as to what Stage 3 of Westconnex will be like.

F. I am concerned that while the EIS finds that tolls do weigh more heavily on lower income motorists, there is no serious analysis of the blatant unfairness of letting of private consortium toll people for decades in order to pay for less profitable tollways for wealthier communities.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Kim Van Address: 81 Holmwood st
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Newtown Postcode NSW
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration** : I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur, further stating that "settlement induced by tunnel excavation and groundwater drawdown may occur in some areas along the tunnel alignment". The risk of ground movement is lessened where tunnelling is more than 35 metres underground. (Vol 2B Appendix E p 1) The planned Inner West Interchange proposes tunnels which are astonishingly shallow eg John St at 22metres Hill St at 28metres Moore St 27metres. Piper St 37metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 2) Catherine St at 28metres(Vol 2B Appendix E Part 1). At these shallow depths, the homes above would indisputably sustain serious structural damage and cracking. Without provision for full compensation for damage there would be no incentive for contractors or Roads and Maritime Services to minimise this damage.

- Rather than ease congestion the project is likely to reduce the availability of funds for projects that enable that genuinely reduce congestion (road pricing), give priority for high productivity road users such as delivery and service vehicles or genuinely avoid congestion (public transport in separate corridors/lanes).

- The EIS projects increases in freight volumes without offering evidence as to how the project enables this. Assertions relating to improvements for freight services rely on the Sydney Gateway Project, which is not part of WestConnex, and which poses significant threats to the crucial freight rail connection to Port Botany. Port Botany itself has questioned whether the current project provides any benefit to it.

- The most highly effected area of Stage 3 will be Rozelle with the massive and complex interchange. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World and it is highly questionable as to whether it can be built at all in the form outlined in the EIS. The EIS does not show any detailed plans as to how this will be achieved. There are no constructional details at all, what is shown is a concept only, this is totally unacceptable.

- There is relatively limited urban redevelopment potential along the small section of Victoria Road that the Project would decongest, and this section is not been classified by the NSW Government as redevelopment area. To claim this as a benefit is misleading.

- Easton Park has a long history and is part of an urban environment which is unusual in Sydney. The park needs to be assessed from a visual design point of view. It will be quite a different park when its view is changed to one of a large ventilation stack. The suggestion that it has been 'saved' needs to be considered in the light of the severe 5 years construction impacts and the reshaped urban environment.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Rita Macharloni
	Address: 60 Warren rd
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Marrickville Postcode 2204
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:

*Please **include** my personal information when publishing this submission to your website*
***Declaration**: I **HAVE NOT** made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.*

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, for the following reasons, and request the Minister reject the application.

- The EIS states that the project will improve connection to the Sydney Airport and Port Botany. It will not. The Premier herself has said that the Sydney Gateway does not form part of the WestConnex project. Without the Sydney Gateway, connections between WestConnex (St Peters Interchange) and Sydney Airport and Port Botany will be via congested surface roads in Botany and Mascot. As the connection is unresolved, it is impossible to determine the effect on demand of the unknown pricing regime that will apply to the Sydney Gateway, nor how much travel time will be incurred – which might actually negate the already marginal proposed travel time savings.

- It is quite clear to me that insufficient research has been done on the archeology of the Rozelle Railway yards. This could be a valuable archeology site. Why has an EIS been put forward without the necessary research being done to further identify potential remains? No project should be approved on the basis of such an inadequate level of research.

- The WestConnex program of works has been described as an integrated transport network solution. However, the role and interdependency with public transport and freight rail is not considered. The recent Government commitment to a Metro West requires a rethink on the need for WestConnex. Particularly as the WestConnex business case outlines a mode shift from public transport to the toll road as a benefit required to justify it economically.

- While WestConnex might integrate with the wider motorway network, no evidence is provided demonstrating that it integrates with the wider road network – let alone the broader transport and land use system. For example the EIS provides no information about changes in traffic volumes entering the Sydney CBD caused by WestConnex. RMS has only just commenced work to identify which roads fanning out from WestConnex portals will need to be upgraded to deliver large numbers of vehicles to and from the project. It is thereformpossible to form a properly informed understanding of the environmental impacts – the very purpose of the EIS.

- Ambient air quality - There is no evidence provided in the EIS that the ventilation outlets will be date. The EIS simply states that 'the ventilation outlets would be designed to effectively disperse the emissions from the tunnel and are predicted to have negligible effect on local air quality (xiv, Executive Summary). This is inadequate and details of the impacts on air quality need to be provided so that the residents and experts can meaningfully comment on the impact.

Campaign Mailing Lists : I would like to volunteer and/or be informed about the anti-WestConnex campaigns - My details must be removed before this submission is lodged, and must be used only for campaign purposes and must not be divulged to other parties

Name _____ Email _____ Mobile _____