

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

Name: ..... *Markus Lambert*

Signature: ..... *J. F. L.*

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: ..... 36 Yarndale St

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

- A. 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.
- B. 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.
- C. 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.
- D. I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney's alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestCONnex.
- 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. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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: ALEX BUDGE

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: 40 CARLISLE ST

Suburb: LEICHHARDT

  
Postcode

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

1. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur (Ch X, p y), 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.
2. 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. As you are no doubt aware, 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. As Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school"
3. 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 there will be 150 vehicles will need to park in nearby local streets which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.
4. 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 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 will become gridlocked during peak times.
5. 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 leads to extra noise and air pollution in this area.
6. 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.
7. Unacceptable noise levels will accompany the construction of this massive interchange. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution in this area.  
There will also be disturbance of soil which may be thick with 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.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: Maximilian Norton
	Address: 54 Edgecliff Road
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Woollahra Postcode 2025
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
<p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website  <b>Declaration :</b> I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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 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 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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. This 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
- 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

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

Name: Elaine Ransome  
Address: 122 Llandaff St Parramatta 2204  
Application Number: SS1 7485

Suburb: Parramatta Postcode

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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 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: \_\_\_\_\_

23/7/19

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: *Kate Hughes*  
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: #10 Emma St

Suburb: Leichhardt

Postcode 2040

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

1. The EIS states that property damage due to ground movement "may occur ~~in the~~" 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.
2. 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**. As you are no doubt aware, 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. As Education Minister Rob Stokes declared in 2017, "No ventilation shafts will be built near any school"
3. 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 there **will be 150 vehicles** will need to park in **nearby local streets** which are already over-subscribed during weekdays by commuters taking the light rail.
4. 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 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 will become gridlocked during peak times.
5. 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 leads to extra noise and air pollution in this area.
6. 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.
7. Unacceptable noise levels will accompany the construction of this massive interchange. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution in this area.  
There will also be disturbance of soil which may be thick with 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.

<p><b>Attention Director</b> Application Number: SSI 7485 Application</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>VICTORIA PYE</u></p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>308/1-13 Burnes Ave</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Marscherville</u> Postcode <u>2204</u></p>
--	---

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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)
7. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. 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.
8. 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.
9. Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.
10. 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.

---

**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 \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>Attention Director</b> Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p><b>Application Name:</b> WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>DAVID</u> <u>MA COONALO</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>D. N. Marshall</u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. <u>I HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>37 BUCKLAND</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Alexandria</u> Postcode <u>2015</u></p>
---	---

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 Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name:	DAVID MACDONALD	
	Address:	37 BUCKLAND	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb:	Alexandria	Postcode 2015
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature:	d.n.murchie	

*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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: ..... *Erika Cawthurey*

Signature: ..... *E. Cawthurey*

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: ..... 35 Finsbury son St

Suburb: ..... Lane Cove Postcode. 2066

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 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 proposal to run trucks so close to homes is dangerous. 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.

◆ 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.

◆ 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.

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: M. Rehen

Signature: M. Rehen

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: Shepherd St

Suburb: Chependale Postcode: 2008

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 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Land Subsidence in the areas of all tunnel routes is of great concern to all residents. This is of especial concern in the Rozelle /Lilyfield area where there are layers of tunnels. There is likely to be ongoing and considerable subsidence even when the tunnels are built due to the ongoing necessity to remove ground water from the tunnels. This will lead to a slow drying out of the sandstone and hence settlement.
- Unacceptable noise levels will accompany the construction of this massive interchange. No analysis has been provided of the magnitude of increased noise pollution which will adversely affect the local citizens.
- 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

---

**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: Roman Deguchi  
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 Demera ave  
Suburb: Haberfield Postcode 2045

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.

- Rozelle Rail Yards and Rozelle Civil Site. It is clear that the most highly affected area of Stage 3 will be the Rozelle area and the massive and hugely complex Rozelle interchange. The suggestion that Westconnex is capable of building this is highly questionable. Nothing like this has been built anywhere else in the World. Considering the simple problems of dust management, noxious gasses and the handling of toxic materials like asbestos that have been so inappropriately dealt with on Stages 1 and 2 by Westconnex this intersection of Stage 3 is a disaster waiting to happen and should definitely not be allowed to proceed without a massive investigation. What has been shown in the EIS is totally inadequate for this project to be allowed to proceed.
- Human health risk (Executive Summary xvi) - 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.
- 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.

- At the western end of Bignell Lane near Pyrmont Bridge Road existing flood depth was identified up to one metre in the 100 year ARI. The NSW Government Floodplain Development Manual (2005) identifies this location as a high flood hazard area.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <u>Alister Wareing</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <u>2/8 Tidswell st</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: <u>Ashfield</u> Postcode <u>2131</u>
<p>Please <u>include</u> / <u>delete</u> (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.</p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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 \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Alister Waring</i>	
	Address: <i>2/8 Tideswell st</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Ashfield</i>	Postcode <i>2131</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>A. Waring</i>	
Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</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:

- o 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.
- o The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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 ?
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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?
- o 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).
- o Other Comments

---

**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 \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>Attention Director</b> Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: <u>Alister Wareing</u></p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>2/8 Tideswell st</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Ashfield</u> Postcode <u>2131</u></p>
--	--

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

- A. 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?
- B. 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.
- C. 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.
- D. It is 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.
- E. 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.
- F. 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.
- G. 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.
- H. 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. 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.
- J. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Submission to:

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

Name: DAN CARROD

Signature: W

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: PO Box 825

Suburb: Lachhardt Postcode 2090

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.

Submission from: Name: ..... <i>Laura Garrison</i> ..... Signature: ..... <i>Pam</i> .....	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
Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> 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: ..... <i>GWT 3, 23 Renwick St.</i> .....	
Suburb: ..... <i>REDFERN</i> ..... Postcode.... <i>2016</i> ..	

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. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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)
7. The original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. 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.
8. 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.
9. Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.
10. 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.

#### Other Comments

---

**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 \_\_\_\_\_

<p>Submission from:</p> <p>Name: <u>Bobbie Henning</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>BH</u></p> <p><i>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></p> <p>Address: <u>Drynan St</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Summer Hill</u> Postcode <u>2130</u></p>	<p>Submission to:</p> <p>Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Attn: Director – Transport Assessments</p> <p>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>
--	---

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 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.
- # 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.
- # 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.
- # 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.
- # Darley Road is confirmed as a 'civil and tunnel site (dive site) with a 'Motorway Operations' site at one end for machinery during the build and will then house permanent water treatment facilities, despite evidence tendered to the Concept Design explaining that this intersection has an high accident rate and is completely unsuitable for such a purpose.
- # 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.
- # 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 ?
- # I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
- # 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: SARITA GREEN

Signature: S

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

Address: 59 KINGSTON ST

Suburb: HABERFIELD Postcode 2045

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 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.
- 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 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.

- All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to falls Street) should have a blanket prohibition on any truck movements and worker contractor parking. These hoems are already

**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: ..... *S. GREEN* .....

Signature: .....

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

Address: ..... *59 KINGSTON ST* .....

Suburb: ..... *HABERFIELD* ..... Postcode *2045*

- We 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.
- Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates an 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.
- The EIS states that, if the current proposal for ventilation facilities do not manage to achieve

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

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.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

**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: ..... *S. CRICCI* .....

Signature: ..... *B* .....

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

Address: ..... *59 KINGSTON ST* .....

Suburb: ..... *HAMPTON* .....

Postcode: *2061* .....

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 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)
- 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)
- The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.
- 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)

- 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 construction and operation of the project will result in 51 property acquisitions. We object to the project in its entirety because of this impact. We note that a number of long-standing businesses have been acquired and that many families and businesses in earlier stages have been forced to go to court to seek fair compensation. We object to the acquisition in particular of the Dan Murphys site. The business was substantially renovated and a new business opened with full knowledge of the likely acquisition. We object to it being acquired and compensated in this circumstances and call on the Government to investigate the circumstances which led to this occurring (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 \_\_\_\_\_

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. GREEN .....

Signature: .....

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

Address: ..... 59 KINGSTON ST .....

Suburb: ..... HAWTHORPE ..... Postcode..... 2041 .....

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 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents to not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- 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.

**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: ..... S. GREGH .....

Signature: ..... D .....

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

Address: ..... 59 KINGSTON ST .....

Suburb: ..... HAWTHORPE Postcode..... 2045

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 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.

- 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.

- The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically mention all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
- 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 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.

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link


Name: Peter Head  
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: 15 Belgrave St  
Suburb: Roseville Postcode 2039

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
5. 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.

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 \_\_\_\_\_

<p>Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Attention: Director – Transport Assessments</p> <p>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Name: K. CLARK</p> <p>Signature: </p> <p><i>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></p> <p>Address: 27 SPARKES ST</p> <p>Suburb: CAMPERDOWN Postcode 2050</p>
---	--

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. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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 ?
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

23.9.17

Submission to: Planning Services Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW 2001	Name: <u>S. Sturgeon</u> Signature: <u>S. Sturgeon</u>
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. <b>Declaration:</b> I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the late 2 years.
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: <u>14 Langwarrin St</u> Suburb: <u>Bathurst</u> Postcode: <u>2795</u>

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

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 a 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.

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: ..... *Alex Hanson* .....

Signature: ..... *[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: ..... 814 moore st .....

Suburb: ..... Dremmoyne ..... Postcode..... 2047

#### 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".

There are many Sydney Water pipes and Council stormwater drains in the site footprint. These are vulnerable to damage. A burst water main or broken pipe leading to water being cut off is inevitable.

If the planned electrical works take place to establish a power supply to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt then disruption of power, NBN and telecoms is also inevitable.

The proponent should be required to have a plan in place to keep residents' power on and to keep residents connected and should communicate this plan to residents. The plan might include portable wifi devices or compensation for disruption. There must be a disincentive to causing disruption.

The proponent should be required to have a plan in place for a burst water main which includes immediately relocating residents and providing a secondary source of water.

The proponent should be required to plan for a secondary source of water so that there is no disruption of supply. Residents should be kept informed regularly about how work is going to impact them.

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 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: Alex Rawson

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: 814 moore ST

Suburb: Druimmooyne Postcode: 1047

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

## 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 vibration 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".

The Department of Planning and Environment should require the proponent to adopt the approach taken by the Crossrail project in the UK which is to publish the noise mitigation policy before the project begins and to identify who will be entitled to mitigation.

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: Alex hawson

Signature: Cos

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: 8/4 moore st

Suburb: Burwood Postcode: 2047

#### 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.

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 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: Alex Hanson

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: 14 Moore St

Suburb: Dreamtime Postcode: 2047

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

### Tunnel vertical alignments:

In 5.3.6 of Chapter 5 the EIS states that 'the tunnels would generally have grades of less than four per cent. However, isolated locations connecting to the surface road network may require short lengths of steeper grades of up to eight per cent. These grades would generally match with existing conditions on local surface roads or are required to ensure appropriate ground conditions with no direct property impacts.'

In 2014 the RMS Advisory Committee on Tunnel Air Quality published a technical paper (TP09) 'Evolution of road tunnels in Sydney'. The paper highlights the key lessons learnt from over 20 years of experience in assessing and operating long road tunnels as it relates to the assessment, design and operation of ventilation systems to manage air quality in and around tunnels.

A key lesson learnt identified in the paper is the need to minimise the gradient of the tunnel.

'The M5 East has a gradient of eight per cent at the exit of the westbound tunnel. The increase in gradient resulted from a late design change to facilitate the placement of tunnel spoil between Bexley Road and King Georges Road. This was to substantially reduce the number of truck movements on local roads during construction.

The unintended consequence of this change was that vehicles exiting the west bound tunnel are under significant load with multiple consequences for air emissions. Firstly vehicle emissions per distance travelled significantly increase with increase in grade. This is especially the case for laden heavy vehicles (eg trucks returning from the port). Secondly the steep grade slows down heavy vehicles which contribute to congestion throughout the west bound tunnel further adding to vehicle emissions as compared to free flowing traffic. Consequently the Cross City and Lane Cove tunnels were designed to minimise gradients.'

As a result of this analysis the RMS concludes that a key design requirement for new road tunnel projects is to minimise grades.

It is therefore astonishing that the proponent is now planning to ignore this advice and repeat the mistakes of the M5 and incorporate tunnels with inclines of up to eight per cent. These steep tunnels will have multiple direct impacts on air emissions.

- vehicle emissions per distance travelled significantly increase with increase in grade. This is especially the case for laden heavy vehicles which the tunnel is intended to take off local roads and which are intended to be users of the tunnel
- the steep grade slows down heavy vehicles which will contribute to congestion further adding to vehicle emissions as compared to free flowing traffic.

In conclusion the proponent should be required to redesign the tunnels so that no gradient exceeds 4%.

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: ..... Alex Hanson .....

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: ..... 814 MOORE ST .....

Suburb: ..... DREMMOYNE ..... Postcode. 2047 .....

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

### Impact of MOC1 on local area:

I oppose the plan for a water treatment plant and an electrical substation to remain on the site of 7 Darley Rd Leichhardt after tunnel construction is complete.

This Motorway Operations Centre 1 (MOC1) is a completely inappropriate use of a site in a residential area with particular characteristics.

The character of Leichhardt is heavily influenced by the street pattern (predominantly north/south extending from Parramatta Road) and built form. The wide carriageways and regular street pattern combined with the topography and a predominance of single storey detached housing gives Leichhardt a more open character than that of Glebe or Annandale.

The suburb is made up of several distinctive residential neighbourhoods including Excelsior Estate, Helsarmel, Piperston and West Leichhardt.

The subject site is within the Helsarmel Distinctive Neighbourhood that is located on the northwest slope of the Leichhardt/Balmain ridge. The Helsarmel Distinctive Neighbourhood is predominated by low scale detached and semi-detached cottages that demonstrated a variety of architectural styles and building materials. Many of these dwellings are Federation or post-war styles, with scattered examples of Californian bungalows and workers cottages.

The desired future character as set out by Council is to maintain the character of the neighbourhood by keeping development complementary in architectural style, form and materials and preserve the low scale cottage character. The suburb profile allows for contemporary development that is complementary to the streetscape.

The MOC1 proposal for a tunnel water treatment plant and an electrical substation is inconsistent with the character of the neighbourhood. This is a residential neighbourhood and what is proposed will permanently degrade our neighbourhood. MOC1 will be a prominent and unwelcome eyesore.

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt and the proposed Motorway Operations Centre 1.

The proponent should identify alternatives locations for water treatment and a substation including at the alternative dive site locations.

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 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: ..... Alex Hanson .....

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: ..... 8/4 Moore St .....

Suburb: ..... Drummoyne ..... Postcode: 2047 .....

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

### **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 ensure that the conditions of any approval are stringent and should require the proponent to pay a predetermined amount of ex gratia payment to residents for each night of disturbance.*

*This should be sufficiently high to deter extended periods of out of hours work at the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt.*

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: ..... Alex Hanson .....

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: ..... 8/4 Moore St .....

Suburb: ..... Drummoyne ..... Postcode..... 2047

#### 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 ensure that the conditions of any approval are stringent and prohibit out of hours work at the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt for more than 2 nights in a row and in any two week period.

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

**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:	<i>Katrina Cooper</i>	
Organisation:		
Address:	<i>36 Marlborough St</i>	Suburb <i>Leichhardt</i> Post Code <i>2040</i>
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No		
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.		
Signed:	<i>Katrina Cooper</i> Date <i>12/10/17</i>	

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

### **Impact of MOC1 on local area**

I oppose the plan for a water treatment plant and an electrical substation to remain on the site of 7 Darley Rd Leichhardt after tunnel construction is complete.

This Motorway Operations Centre 1 (MOC1) is a completely inappropriate use of a site in a residential area with particular characteristics.

The character of Leichhardt is heavily influenced by the street pattern (predominantly north/south extending from Parramatta Road) and built form. The wide carriageways and regular street pattern combined with the topography and a predominance of single storey detached housing gives Leichhardt a more open character than that of Glebe or Annandale.

The suburb is made up of several distinctive residential neighbourhoods including Excelsior Estate, Helsarmel, Piperston and West Leichhardt.

The subject site is within the Helsarmel Distinctive Neighbourhood that is located on the northwest slope of the Leichhardt/Balmain ridge. The Helsarmel Distinctive Neighbourhood is predominated by low scale detached and semi-detached cottages that demonstrated a variety of architectural styles and building materials. Many of these dwellings are Federation or post-war styles, with scattered examples of Californian bungalows and workers cottages.

The desired future character as set out by Council is to maintain the character of the neighbourhood by keeping development complementary in architectural style, form and materials and preserve the low scale cottage character. The suburb profile allows for contemporary development that is complementary to the streetscape.

The MOC1 proposal for a tunnel water treatment plant and an electrical substation is inconsistent with the character of the neighbourhood. This is a residential neighbourhood and what is proposed will permanently degrade our neighbourhood. MOC1 will be a prominent and unwelcome eyesore.

**The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt and the proposed Motorway Operations Centre 1. The proponent should identify alternatives locations for water treatment and a substation including at the alternative dive site locations. The proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.**

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:	<i>Katrina Cooper</i>	
Address:	<i>36 Marlborough St</i>	Suburb <i>Leichhardt</i> Post Code <i>2040</i>
Signature:	<i>Katrina Cooper</i>	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No		
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. <i>L.C.</i>		

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 impacts

- The proponent has identified that the most affected receivers are residential receivers which adjoin the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on Darley Road between Norton Street and Falls Street. The most noise affected receivers are located between Charles Street and Norton Street due to their proximity to the construction site.

The proponent has identified that the worst case construction scenario will occur during

- Road adjustments works
- spoil handling works within the acoustic shed during all works periods

Highest construction noise impacts:

- Use of a rock breaker during the daytime period as part of the demolition works and
- Use of a road profiler during the night-time period as part of the road adjustment works

I object to the EIS because the proponent provides that spoil handling works within the acoustic shed will take place for the duration of the construction phase which could be up to two to three years' duration, yet there is no clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts.

- I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the basis that there is no clear plan in the EIS for measures that will provide the maximum possible level of mitigation from noise impacts. I also object because there is no clear plan for remedies available to residents who are impacted.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent's assessment of who are Highly Noise Affected receivers in the area adjacent to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt is incorrect and wrongly minimises the actual number of Highly Noise Affected receivers.
- Many residents in Charles St and Hubert St were highly affected by noise from works conducted during the renovation of 7 Darley Rd in 2016. In Hubert St, residents at least as far as No 31 and No 32 Hubert St were affected. The affected properties are not correctly reflected in the EIS.

I object to the EIS because it underestimates the number of residents that will be highly affected by noise. It does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site.

- I object to the EIS because the proponent incorrectly asserts construction traffic is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in LAeq noise levels at receivers along the proposed construction traffic routes (Darley Road, Leichhardt and City West Link). This does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site. The impact of these will be substantial.

Commercial trucks are very loud; a standard diesel engine produces approximately 100 decibels (dB) of noise.

Engine braking noise can be disturbing both because it is loud and also as it has a distinctive characteristic modulation. Engine braking noise is caused by pulses of gases being emitted from the truck exhaust system, giving a 'machine gun' sound.

I object to the Darley Rd site because of the level of noise that the trucks will cause.

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:	Katrina Coope	Suburb	Leichhardt
Address:	36 Marlborough St	Post Code	2040
Signature:	<i>Katrina Coope</i>		
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.			

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 impacts

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because engine noise from the trucks approaching the intersection up the grade would be a constant source of annoyance to residents of Darley Road down to its intersection with Charles Street.

The independent engineer engaged by the Inner West Council Jim Holt also came to this conclusion in his report to the Council. SMC have not recognised this impact in the EIS. They sent a response to the Council as follows:

**'Response:** Noise from construction traffic using the public road network is assessed under the Roads and Maritime Noise Criteria Guideline (NCG), which documents Roads and Maritime's approach to implementing the Road Noise Policy (RNP). Under the NCG, an initial screening test is carried out to determine whether noise levels would increase by more than two decibels (dBA). This represents an increase in the number of vehicles of approximately 60 per cent due to construction traffic or a temporary reroute due to a road closure. Where increases are 2dBA or less, then further assessment is required as noise level changes would most likely not be perceptible to most people. Where noise levels increase by more than 2dBA (i.e. 2.1 dBA or greater) further assessment is required using criteria presented in the NCG.

Darley Road is currently being used by heavy vehicles and light commercial vehicles (construction, delivery etc) that contribute to background noises. The predicted traffic noise increase (dBA) at the Darley Road site is around 0.5dBA.'

You do not need to be an acoustic engineer to know that truck and dogs are very noisy and that local residents will be impacted greatly, especially those close to where trucks will be accelerating and decelerating. Darley Road, Leichhardt is not currently experiencing 14 truck and dog movements an hour during peak time stated in the EIS and an unknown (but presumably greater) number of truck movements within off peak construction hours. This is a truck movement every 3-4 minutes during peak. Assuming that they will increase truck movements during off peak residents can expect a truck every 2-3 minutes. We do not need a screening test or assessment to tell us that residents will be subjected to extreme levels of truck noise.



SMC's response does not acknowledge this and does not refute Jim Holt's conclusion that residents will be impacted. SMC's response like the proponent's EIS fails to acknowledge the true impact of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.

The resident's of Darley Rd, Francis, Hubert and Charles St have little acoustic protection against the noise of truck engines, exhaust and brakes and non is contemplated in the EIS.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because the truck noise impacts for residents will be too great for the extended period of construction involved and the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt should be rejected on this basis.

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:	Kathna Cooper	Suburb:	Leichhardt	Post Code:	2040
Address:	36 Marlborough St				
Signature:					
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / No					
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. 					

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 impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has not provided details of the noise mitigation measures proposed in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. As a result it is not possible to assess the noise impacts of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. It is unacceptable for the proponent to establish a major construction site in the middle of a residential area without a clear plan for mitigating noise impacts.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) 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. In addition, temporary noise mitigation measures may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings, which would be provided to minimise noise impacts on surrounding properties.'

Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) will create a high level of noise impact for residents yet the proponent has not given details of the plan for mitigating this impact. The measures will be implemented only if 'reasonable and feasible' which is a subjective assessment as it does not state whether they will be assessed as reasonable from the standpoint of the proponent or the residents. What the proponent thinks is reasonable may not meet the residents expectation as to what is reasonable. The measures appear to be optional as the proponent only states that 'may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings'.

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has not provided a clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts from work within and outside of standard construction hours at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the fact that the demolition of 7 Darley Road, Leichhardt will remove a significant noise barrier to traffic noise from the City West Link. This will mean increased traffic noise impacts to the residents of Darley Rd, Francis St, Hubert St and Charles St.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of fully laden spoil haulage trucks exiting the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt driving up the very steep blind turn at the intersection with the City West Link. The RMS should install noise measuring equipment and monitoring cameras at this location to measure noise from heavy vehicles and identify vehicles whose noise exceeds the applicable Australian standard.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of spoil haulage trucks using air brakes on the descent down Darley Rd off the City West Link. Heavy vehicle drivers should avoid using exhaust brakes, engine compression or 'jake' brakes near residential areas and noise-sensitive areas such as hospitals and schools, unless they are necessary for safety reasons. RMS should implement noise limits from engine compression brakes and should use roadside noise 'cameras' as an aid to enforcement at every location where WestConnex vehicles emitting engine compression brake noise might affect nearby communities.

**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:	<i>Katrina Cooper</i>	
Address:	<i>36 Marlborough St</i>	Suburb <i>Leichhardt</i> Post Code <i>2040</i>
Signature:	<i>Katrina C.</i>	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K. C.		

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


#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft noise and construction noise

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and the aircraft noise which the residents near the site already endure.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airservices Australia reports that in April to June 2017 the number of average daily noise events over 70 dBA. In Leichhardt this is an average of 16-17 per hour over the peak morning period and 16 per hour in the early evening peak period.



I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel engine, exhaust and potentially air brake noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours.

**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:	<i>Katrina Coope</i>	
Address:	36 Marlborough St Suburb	Leichhardt Post Code 2040
Signature:	<i>Katrina C</i>	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No		
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

**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 impacts

- **I object** to the EIS because the proponent incorrectly asserts construction traffic is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in LAeq noise levels at receivers along the proposed construction traffic routes (Darley Road, Leichhardt and City West Link). This does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site. The impact of these will be substantial.

Commercial trucks are very loud; a standard diesel engine produces approximately 100 decibels (dB) of noise.

Engine braking noise can be disturbing both because it is loud and also as it has a distinctive characteristic modulation. Engine braking noise is caused by pulses of gases being emitted from the truck exhaust system, giving a 'machine gun' sound.

**I object** to the Darley Rd site because of the level of noise that the trucks will cause.

#### Truck routes

- **I object** to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be detailed in the CTAMP, Preferred Infrastructure Report or Ancillary Facilities Management Plan.  
Peter Jones of SMC has on many occasions made representations to the community that his plan is to stage trucks from the port and eventually when possible to have them arrive and depart from the site underground when a tunnel is established between Leichhardt and the M4 East. He has also said that loading of spoil would take place underground at this time. He has recently told us of his plan to load trucks from a ramp off the city west link by means of a hopper conveyor which would pass over the Light rail station delivering spoil into silos below which trucks would pull up to receive their load. The laden trucks would then travel west bound along the city west link. None of this plan is detailed in the EIS.  
**I object** to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. **I object** to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into the CTAMP, PIR or AFMP on matters which will have a devastating impact to me and to residents near 7 Darley Rd.

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:	Katrina Cooper	Suburb	Leichhardt
Address:	36 Marlborough St	Post Code	2040
Signature:			
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No			
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.			

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

#### Pedestrian and cyclist movements

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the temporary changes to Darley Road, Leichhardt to enable access to and from the ancillary facility that would likely be required in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be decided by the contractor.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that:


'Temporary changes to Darley Road to enable access to and from the ancillary facility would likely be required. These may include changes to line marking to provide a temporary turning lane for construction traffic and temporary diversions to the pedestrian path on the northern side of Darley Road. These would be confirmed during detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor and in consideration of the safety and function of the road network, maintaining access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop and providing for continued pedestrian and cyclist movement.'

It is not clear how continued access, pedestrian and cyclist movement will be preserved and I am concerned that the impacts have not been correctly identified and assessed by the proponent.

I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I object to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor.

#### Light rail access

- I object to the EIS because it does not guarantee that the existing access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop would be maintained at all times. Fig 6-4 indicates that only the eastern access will be maintained. This greatly disadvantages the elderly and disabled who have to walk up a steep hill to the eastern access. If the proponent cannot guarantee access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop from the existing entry points or from points that are accessible to all then the Darley Road, Leichhardt construction site should be abandoned. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on users of the Light Rail.



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:	Katrina Cooper	Suburb	Leichhardt	Post Code
Address:	36 Marlborough St	2040		
Signature:				
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No				
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K.				

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

#### Truck routes

- I object to the EIS because it suggests that no local roads would be used by heavy vehicles during works yet at the same time acknowledges that spoil trucks may use local roads in exceptional circumstances which include when there is queuing to get into the site. Darley Rd is highly congested with traffic queues forming during much of the day which will lead to queues to enter the site. Queuing will not therefore be an exceptional circumstance and the result will be that spoil trucks are able to use local roads without being in breach, which will be often. This is unacceptable to residents of Francis, Hubert, William and Charles St and I object to the EIS on this basis. As queuing cannot be avoided on Darley Rd this clearly shows why this location is inappropriate. The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?
- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site, which SMC have on many occasions told the community they are contemplating as alternatives.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that 'It is anticipated that the majority of construction traffic would enter the site from the southern (westbound) carriageway of Darley Road, Leichhardt via new driveways. Heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt. A temporary right turning lane at the intersection of City West Link and Darley Road, Leichhardt would be provided for use by construction vehicles. Heavy vehicles would exit the site by turning left onto Darley Road, Leichhardt before turning left onto City West Link.'

'Construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) via the westbound lanes of City West Link.'

'Temporary traffic management measures would be established to enable access and egress arrangements. These would be detailed in a CTAMP, which would be prepared to manage construction traffic associated with the project.'

I object to the proposal for vehicles associated with spoil haulage to travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Rd. This proposal is dangerous and the impacts and risks are too great. Darley Rd is acknowledged by RMS to be a sub-standard road in terms of its construction. The intersection from the city west link is a steep blind turn even for traffic coming across from James St. This is followed by immediate left hand turns into both Francis St and Hubert St. A number of properties on Darley Rd would be at risk of destruction from spoil haulage trucks in the event of a truck having to brake suddenly to avoid stationary vehicles.

The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be detailed in the CTAMP, Preferred Infrastructure Report or Ancillary Facilities Management Plan.

Peter Jones of SMC has on many occasions made representations to the community that his plan is to stage trucks from the port and eventually when possible to have them arrive and depart from the site underground when a tunnel is established between Leichhardt and the M4 East. He has also said that loading of spoil would take place underground at this time. He has recently told us of his plan to load trucks from a ramp off the city west link by means of a hopper conveyor which would pass over the Light rail station delivering spoil into silos below which trucks would pull up to receive their load. The laden trucks would then travel west bound along the city west link. None of this plan is detailed in the EIS.

I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I object to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into the CTAMP, PIR or AFMP on matters which will have a devastating impact to me and to residents near 7 Darley Rd.

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:	Katrina Cooper		
Address:	36 Marlborough ST	Suburb	LEICHHARDT
Signature:	K. C.	Post Code	2040
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No			
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K. C.			

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

#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft emissions and spoil truck emissions

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of emissions from spoil truck vehicles from its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and emissions from aircraft to which residents near the site are already exposed.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airplane exhaust, like car exhaust, contains a variety of air pollutants, including sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Many of these particles of pollution are tiny, about a hundred millionths of an inch wide, or smaller than the width of a human hair. So-called particulate matter that's especially small is the main culprit in human health effects, especially since the particulates can become wedged deep in the lung and possibly enter the bloodstream, scientists say.

Exposure to loud noise from living under a flight path over a long period of time may increase the risk of developing high blood pressure or having a stroke, a 2013 study by researchers at the University of Athens suggests.

Researchers examined data from 420 people living near busy Athens International Airport in Greece and found living with high noise levels from aircraft, especially at night, was associated with high blood pressure.

Every additional 10 decibels of night-time aircraft noise appeared to result in a 69 per cent increased risk of high blood pressure, also known as hypertension.

The researchers at the University of Athens found that around half the participants (just under 45 per cent) were exposed to more than 55 decibels of daytime aircraft noise, while around one in four (just over 27 per cent) were exposed to more than 45 decibels of night-time aircraft noise.


Only around one in 10 (11 per cent) were exposed to significant road traffic noise of more than 55 decibels.

Between 2004-6 and 2013, 71 people were newly diagnosed with high blood pressure and 44 were diagnosed with heart flutter (cardiac arrhythmia), while a further 18 had a heart attack, the researchers found.

I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because in addition to the existing aircraft emissions and noise experienced by people living near the site, this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel exhaust emissions and noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours. This will give rise to increased health risks from noise and air pollution which research suggest will cause increased blood pressure and risk of stroke.

**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:	<b>CATRINA COOPER</b>		
Address:	36 MARLBOROUGH ST	Suburb	Leichhardt Post Code 2040
Signature:			
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No			
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

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

#### Non-compliance with SEARS

- I object to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

Peter Jones from Sydney Motorway Corporation has advised that he is in the process of finalising an agreement with Sydney Ports which will enable him to stage trucks from a location on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. The EIS should not have been released before this plan was finalised. Peter Jones has advised that he is only required to describe the 'worst case scenario' in the EIS, which is trucks arriving ad hoc via the eastbound lanes of City West Link. The EIS should describe what the proponent actually plans to do as well as the worst case scenario so that the impacts of all options being considered can be assessed and commented on.

It is not clear from the EIS how the alternative plan for the staged arrival of spoil trucks from Sydney Ports will be documented and how stakeholders will have an opportunity to assess its impacts. The EIS does not specifically state that this staged arrival plan will be documented in the CTAMP, the Ancillary Facilities Management Plan or the Preferred Infrastructure Report.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it does not comply with the SEARS.

#### Truck routes


- I object to the EIS because it suggests that no local roads would be used by heavy vehicles during works yet at the same time acknowledges that spoil trucks may use local roads in exceptional circumstances which include when there is queuing to get into the site. Darley Rd is highly congested with traffic queues forming during much of the day which will lead to queues to enter the site. Queuing will not therefore be an exceptional circumstance and the result will be that spoil trucks are able to use local roads without being in breach, which will be often. This is unacceptable to residents of Francis, Hubert, William and Charles St and I object to the EIS on this basis. As queuing cannot be avoided on Darley Rd this clearly shows why this location is inappropriate. The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?

#### Noise impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of fully laden spoil haulage trucks exiting the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt driving up the very steep blind turn at the intersection with the City West Link. The RMS should install noise measuring equipment and monitoring cameras at this location to measure noise from heavy vehicles and identify vehicles whose noise that exceeds the applicable Australian standard.

**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:	KATRINA COOPER
Address:	36 MARLBOROUGH ST Suburb LEICHHARDT Post Code 2040
Signature:	
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No	
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. 	

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

#### Non-compliance with SEARS

- I object to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.  
  
The EIS has been released before the proponent is able to describe how it actually plans to carry out construction activities at Darley Road, Leichhardt, in particular the plan for staging the arrival of spoil trucks.

#### Hours of operation

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'Spoil handling associated with tunnelling supported by the Darley Road civil and tunnel site would occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Spoil would be handled below ground wherever practicable to reduce the potential for amenity impacts in adjacent areas. Spoil handing at the surface outside standard day time construction hours would occur within an acoustic shed to manage potential amenity impacts. Spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours, between 7.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

**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:	<i>Katrina Lager</i>		
Address:	36 MARLBOROUGH ST	Suburb	LEICHHARDT Post Code 2040
Signature:	<i>Katrina Lager</i>		
Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No			
Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. <i>Katrina Lager</i>			

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

#### Construction vehicle safety impacts

I object to the EIS because the proposal in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt stated therein, that 'heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt' presents unacceptable safety and amenity impacts.

The corner of Darley Rd (actually James St) and the City West Link is a pedestrian zone for:

- Pupils of Orange Grove Public School who live in Leichhardt
- Students of Sydney Secondary College, Leichhardt Campus who alight at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Students of other schools along the light rail who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Commuters who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Residents walking to Leichhardt Park Aquatic Centre and adjacent sporting facilities
- Residents walking to the Orange Grove markets on Saturdays

The proponents plan brings pedestrians and school children in particular directly into the path of spoil haulage trucks at an intersection found to be the third most dangerous according to Transport for NSW figures.

A further impact will be to discourage people from walking in this area leading to greater car use for local trips.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the above grounds.

#### Noise impacts

I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the fact that the demolition of 7 Darley Road, Leichhardt will remove a significant noise barrier to traffic noise from the City West Link. This will mean increased traffic noise impacts to the residents of Darley Rd, Francis St, Hubert St and Charles St.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>
	Address: <i>13 Hubert St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>
Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. <b>Declaration:</b> 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, in particular as relates to the proposed Darley Road civil and construction site, for the following reasons:

1. The project will worsen traffic near the Darley Road civil and tunnel site during and after construction – Leichhardt: 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 bay 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 pedestrians.
2. Impact on traffic once project opens – The EIS states that the road network will improve once the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link opens, which means that residents will have to endure worsened traffic conditions for up to 10 years before any real reprieve. While the traffic on the City West Link is forecast to decrease by up to 40 per cent once the project is completed, this is based on commuters choosing to use the tollways. There is limited evidence to support these traffic statistics and it is likely that many drivers (as is the case with the Cross City tunnel) will choose to use local roads to avoid the toll which will result in significant rat-running. I object to the approval of this EIS on the basis that it will not decrease traffic on local streets and that there is no plan to manage rat running from toll dodgers.
3. Constant out of hours work expected and permitted – Leichhardt: 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 this will be used as a justification for frequent out-of-hours work. This will create an unacceptable noise impact on those living close to the Darley Road 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 which is not acceptable (Executive Summary xiv).

---

**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: Jenni Bruce

Signature: Jenni Bruce

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

Address: 13 Hubert 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 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.
- 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: Jenni Bruce

Signature: Jenni Bruce

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

Declaration : I

Address: 13 Hubert St

Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040

- ✓ 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.
  
- ✓ 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

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

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.

- ✓ The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically mention all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
  
- ✓ 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.

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: Jenni Bruce  
Signature: Jenni Bruce

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: 13 Hubert 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

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: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>
	Address: <i>13 Hubert St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>
Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Declaration : I <b>HAVE NOT</b> 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, including in particular the proposed Darley Road civil and tunnel site, for the following reasons:

1. Acoustic shed – Leichhardt: The EIS does not require the installation of an acoustic shed, stating instead 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. The acoustic shed that is mentioned offers the lower grade noise protection 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 an acoustic shed will **not** contain the noise to an acceptable level. In addition, a temporary access tunnel will be built from the north 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 noise mitigation measures.
2. 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.' (EIS, 6-52) 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.
3. Return of the site after construction – Leichhardt: The Darley Road site will not be returned to the community after the project, with a substantial portion permanently housing a Motorways Operations facility which involves a substation and water treatment plant. The effect of this is that the residents will not be able to directly access the North Light rail Station from Darley Road, but will continue to have to traverse Canal Road and use the narrow path from the side. 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 in principle 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: Jenni Bruce  
Signature: Jenni Bruce

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

Address: 13 Hubert 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 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: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>	003821-M00006
	Address: <u>13 Hubert St</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>	
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>	
<p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p>Declaration : I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>		

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 further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 has many caveats and depends upon further steps (such as traffic management plans), the detail of which is not provided. The community has no certainty that any of the impacts from construction will be managed to an acceptable level.
3. 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.
4. 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)
5. 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)
6. There are 36 homes identified as having severe noise impacts during construction in Leichhardt and Lilyfield. No noise barriers have been identified so residents are unable to comment as to whether this impact will be reduced. No proposal for alternative accommodation is provided. This is unacceptable and all of the proposed noise mitigation options should be detailed in the EIS so that residents have an opportunity to comment on what is proposed. (Executive Summary xvii)
7. There is no plan to manage traffic on Darley Road proposed in the EIS. This critical arterial road is regularly congested at peak periods. Reference in the EIS to developing a traffic management plan in the future is not acceptable. The detail of what is proposed needs to be contained in the EIS so that residents can assess whether the impact of 170 light and heavy vehicle movements a day in and out of the site can be acceptably managed.

---

**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: <u>Jenni Bree</u>
	Address: <u>13 Hubert St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>Jenni Bree</u>
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 proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. I object 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.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically provide that all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
4. 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.
5. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed or any detail provided. 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 uninhabitable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
6. The EIS does not even 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.

---

**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: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>
	Address: <u>13 Hubert St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>
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: <u>Jenni Brue</u>
	Address: <u>13 Hubert St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>Jenni Brue</u>
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:

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 as it will create unacceptable noise impacts for the community and lead to traffic chaos, along with creating an increased risk of accidents to pedestrians and cycle users.
2. The substation and water treatment plant proposed for Darley Road should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link so that it is less visible to residents. 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. *Ease of access to the light rail stop is of critical significance to residents with disabilities.*
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the acknowledged constraints of the Darley Rd 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, as pertains to the Darley Road site, needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.
4. At the conclusion of the construction period, the Darley Road 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 approval conditions need to mandate that the Darley Rd site is to be preserved as green space or other community purposes at the conclusion of the construction period.
5. No trucks (heavy or light) should be permitted on any streets adjacent to Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street). A blanket prohibition should be in force with respect to any worker vehicles from the construction site parking on these local streets. These homes will already suffer the worst construction impacts and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and the additional noise impacts of additional cars on their street. These local streets are not designed to handle heavy vehicle movements. Therefore, any approval conditions need to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all local streets adjacent to Darley Road.
6. Any approval conditions and the relevant construction contracts must require that all workers to the Darley Rd site are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail, with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads adjacent to the Darley Road site. The site currently provides only 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.

**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: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>
	Address: <u>13 Hubert St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485.	Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>
<p>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p>Declaration : I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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 selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. The period of construction proposed is unacceptably long. Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years while the EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This period creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.
3. 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. The EIS states 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.
4. No truck movements should be permitted on Darley Rd or any local roads in Leichhardt or adjoining suburbs. 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 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. I object to the selection of the Darley Rd site altogether, but propose this alternative, which appears to represent the least worst impact, should be chosen if this site is to be used.
5. I object to the number of truck movements proposed at the Darley Road site. The EIS states that there will be 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, as is currently provided.
6. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets and provide a plan for enforcement (to be paid for by my SMC and not by the Inner West Council).

---

**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: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>
	Address: <u>13 Hubert St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>
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:

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 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.
3. The impacts in the EIS are misleading because they do not include any detail of the cumulative impact caused by the overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 (of up to one year). 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 multiple WestConnex projects. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure. Nor does the EIS provide for any traffic management to prevent rat running during the period of construction, when Stages 1 and 2 have opened. The EIS should not be approved without this detail and adequate plans to manage this impact.
4. 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)
5. The EIS states that all vegetation on the Darley Road site will be removed. This includes a mature large tree which provides a visual and noise barrier from the City West Link. The tree should not be permitted to be removed.
6. Despite the fact the EIS identifies over 30 homes with severe noise impacts, no mitigation is mandated. While the possibility of noise walls is flagged, along with in-home treatments, none of this is a requirement. Nor is any detail provided on which residents or business owners can comment. 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: <u>Jenni Bixle</u>	
	Address: <u>13 Hubert St</u>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u>	Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>Jenni Bixle</u>	
<p>Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.</p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I <b>HAVE NOT</b> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, in particular as relates to the proposed Darley Road civil and tunnel site, for the following reasons:

1. 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.
2. Local road diversions and closures – Leichhardt: The proposal should be rejected on the basis that it does not adequately address and provide for the management of the unacceptable traffic impacts of the proposed construction site. The EIS states that road diversions and closures 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.
3. Environmental issues - Substation and water treatment plant – Leichhardt: The EIS proposes that 'treated' water will be directly discharged into the stormwater drain at Blackmore oval on a permanent basis from the date of the project opening in 2022. This plan will jeopardise the integrity of our waterway and compromise the use of the bay for recreational activities for boat and other users. There are four long-standing rowing clubs in the vicinity of this location. I object in the strongest terms to this proposal on environmental and health reasons. The EIS provides no detail whatsoever as to the impact of the ongoing Motorway activities during operation. 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 impacts (on parking, safety, noise, amenity of the area) are not provided in the EIS.
4. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: Jenni Bruce  
Signature: Jenni Bruce

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: 13 Hubert 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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- 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.
- 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.
- 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 all vegetation will be removed on the site which includes a mature tree. I object to the removal of the tree which creates a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the tree is removed it must be replaced with a mature tree as soon as the remediation of the site commences.
- 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 on this site.
- 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.

---

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: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>
	Address: <u>13 Hubert St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>Jenni Bruce</u>
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:

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. 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. The EIS does not mention that 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

---

**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: Jenni Bruce

Signature: Jenni Bruce

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

Declaration : I

Address: 13 Hubert 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 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.

✓ 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.

✓ 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 all vegetation will be removed on the site which includes a mature tree. I object to the removal of the tree which creates a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the tree is removed it must be replaced with a mature tree as soon as the remediation of the site commences.

*This access is vital for people with disabilities.*

✓ 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 on this site.

✓ 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.

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: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>	
	Address: <i>18 Thibert St</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i>	Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>	
Please <u>INCLUDE</u> 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, in particular as relates to the proposed Darley Road civil and tunnel site, for the following reasons:

1. 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.
2. 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 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.
3. Alternative housing for residents – Leichhardt: The EIS needs to provide 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, nor 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 3-4 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.
4. 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. The EIS should not be approved as it contains insufficient detail to enable residents to know the impacts of the proposed construction works.

---

**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: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>
	Address: <i>13 Hubert St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>
Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. Declaration: I <b>HAVE NOT</b> 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, including in particular the proposed Darley Road civil and tunnel site, for the following reasons:

1. Health risks to residents – Leichhardt: The EIS states that the ‘main risks’ during construction would be associated with dust soiling and the effect of airborne particles and human health and amenity (xii). This will affect local air quality. The Darley Road site is contaminated and the building likely contains asbestos. the EIS does not provide for any mitigation other than an acoustic shed for spoil handling - this is inadequate and the EIS should not be approved without detail of how this will be properly managed.
2. 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 (impacts, advantages and disadvantages etc) on which residents can comment. No spoil truck movements should be permitted on Darley Road and the plans for alternative access should be expedited and provided on an urgent basis so that residents can comment. It should be a condition of approval that the alternative access is confirmed. No trucks should be permitted to access Darley Road due to the unacceptable noise, safety and traffic issues that the current proposal creates.
3. Current propsoed truck route – Leichhardt: 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 up to 5 years running directly by the small homes 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. There have been two fatalities on Darley Road at the proposed site location. Despite the unacceptable impact to nearby homes, there is no proposal for noise walls, nor any mitigation to individual homes.
4. Existing vegetation – Leichhardt: The EIS proposes removal of all vegetation on the Darley Road site. There are several mature trees located on the site which serves as a visual and noise barrier to the heavy City West Link traffic. Removal of these trees 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 trees needs to be retained on this and environmental grounds.
5. Indicative works program – Leichhardt: 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.

**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: Jenni Bruce  
Signature: Jenni Bruce

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

Address: 13 Hubert St  
Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040

- ✓ 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.
- ✓ 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.
- ✓ 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

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

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.

- ✓ No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride' facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- ✓ 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.

**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: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>	
	Address: <i>13 Hubert St</i>	
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i>	Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>Jenni Bruce</i>	
<p>Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.</p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>		

I object to the whole of the WestConnex Project, and the specific WestConnex M4-M5 Link proposals as contained in the EIS application, including in particular the proposed Darley Road civil and tunnel site, for the following reasons:

1. Worker car parking – Leichhardt: The EIS does not provide appropriate parking for the estimated 100 or so workers that the EIS states will be at the site on a daily basis. Other sites have parking specified for site workers (Northcote Civil site (150)) and Parramatta Road East Civil site (140). The EIS states that 20 residential parks will also be removed on Darley Road and is not clear whether Darley Road will become a clearway. Our local streets are at capacity because of limited off-street parking and the Light Rail stop which means local streets are used for commuters. The EIS states that workers 'will be encouraged to use public transport.' This is not good enough and does not leave any room for enforcement where local streets are used for parking. The EIS needs to mandate that **no** trucks or construction vehicles are permitted to park in local streets. There needs to be an enforceable condition that all workers use the Light Rail stop which is adjacent to the site or a plan to bus in workers.
2. Accidents – Leichhardt: 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. The traffic forecasts in the EIS state that Darley Road will have 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day. 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. The addition of hundreds of heavy truck movements a day into that intersection will increase the risk of serious accidents for both pedestrians and drivers. The EIS states that the levels of service are expected to Darley Road is next to the North Leichhardt Light Rail stop which is a pedestrian hub. Children travelling to school walk to the stop. Active transport users such as bicycle riders will be at risk, along with pedestrians using Canal Road to access the Bay Run, Leichhardt pool and the dog park. No trucks should be permitted to travel on local streets or Darley Road.
3. Traffic – Leichhardt: I object to the location of the Darley Road civil and construction site because the site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the wider inner west to access and cross the City West Link. Both Darley Road and the City West Link/James Street intersection are already congested at peak hours. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased, along with rat running through local streets.

---

**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: Jenni Bruce  
Signature: Jenni Bruce

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

Address: 13 Huon St  
Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040

- ✓ We 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.
- ✓ Tunnel depths the tunnel depths for the Leichhardt area as low as 35 metres. This creates an 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.
- ✓ The EIS states that, if the current proposal for ventilation facilities do not manage to achieve

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

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.

- ✓ 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.
- ✓ 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.
- ✓ 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.

**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: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]
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: 12 October 2017

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". There are many Sydney Water pipes and Council stormwater drains in the site footprint. These are vulnerable to damage. A burst water main or broken pipe leading to water being cut off is inevitable. If the planned electrical works take place to establish a power supply to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt then disruption of power, NBN and telecoms is also inevitable. **The proponent should be required to have a plan in place to keep residents' power on and to keep residents connected and should communicate this plan to residents. The plan might include portable WIFI devices or compensation for disruption. There must be a disincentive to causing**

disruption. **The proponent should be required** to have a plan in place for a burst water main which includes immediately relocating residents and providing a secondary source of water.

**The proponent should be required** to plan for a secondary source of water so that there is no disruption of supply. no have the Residents should be kept informed regularly about how work is going to impact them.

Signed: 

**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: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]
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: 12 October 2017

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

#### Tunnel vertical alignments

In 5.3.6 of Chapter 5 the EIS states that 'the tunnels would generally have grades of less than four per cent. However, isolated locations connecting to the surface road network may require short lengths of steeper grades of up to eight per cent. These grades would generally match with existing conditions on local surface roads or are required to ensure appropriate ground conditions with no direct property impacts.' In 2014 the RMS Advisory Committee on Tunnel Air Quality published a technical paper (TP09) 'Evolution of road tunnels in Sydney'. The paper highlights the key lessons learnt from over 20 years of experience in assessing and operating long road tunnels as it relates to the assessment, design and operation of ventilation systems to manage air quality in and around tunnels.

A key lesson learnt identified in the paper is the need to minimise the gradient of the tunnel.

'The M5 East has a gradient of eight per cent at the exit of the westbound tunnel. The increase in gradient resulted from a late design change to facilitate the placement of tunnel spoil between Bexley Road and King Georges Road. This was to substantially reduce the number of truck movements on local roads during construction.'

The unintended consequence of this change was that vehicles exiting the west bound tunnel are under significant load with multiple consequences for air emissions. Firstly, vehicle emissions per distance travelled significantly increase with increase in grade. This is especially the case for laden heavy vehicles (e.g. trucks returning from the port). Secondly the steep grade slows down heavy vehicles which contribute to congestion throughout the west bound tunnel further adding to vehicle emissions as compared to free-flowing traffic. Consequently, the Cross City and Lane Cove tunnels were designed to minimise gradients.'

As a result of this analysis the RMS concludes that a key design requirement for new road tunnel projects is to minimise grades. It is therefore astonishing that the proponent is now planning to ignore this advice and repeat the mistakes of the M5 and incorporate tunnels with inclines of up to eight per cent. These steep tunnels will have multiple direct impacts on air emissions.

- vehicle emissions per distance travelled significantly increase with increase in grade. This is especially the case for laden heavy vehicles which the tunnel is intended to take off local roads and which are intended to be users of the tunnel
- the steep grade slows down heavy vehicles which will contribute to congestion further adding to vehicle emissions as compared to free-flowing traffic.

**In conclusion the proponent should be required to redesign the tunnels so that no gradient exceeds 4%.**

Signed: 

**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: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]
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: 12 October 2017

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

**Traffic and transport - use of local roads by heavy vehicles**

**I object** to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS which require that the Proponent must assess construction transport and traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and cyclists) impacts in relation to access constraints and impacts on public transport, pedestrians and cyclists.

In Note 1 to Table 8-43 'Indicative access routes to and from construction ancillary facilities' the proponent states that 'Some use of local roads by heavy vehicles delivering materials and/or equipment may also be required, however this would be minimised as far as practicable.'

The experience of residents in local streets near other tunnel construction sites such as the streets near the M4 East site at Northcote St Haberfield is that heavy and light vehicles use these local streets and cause a high level of adverse impact. The complaints relate to construction vehicles parking out local residents, idling engines, using local roads after hours and carrying rattling loads that increase the noise impact to residents.

**I object** to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because if it is allowed to proceed then it is inevitable that residents of Charles St, Hubert St and Francis St, which are quiet residential streets, will experience these same very adverse impacts. Once approval is given residents will not be able to enforce a minimal level of use of local roads by light or heavy vehicles associated with the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road. It is inevitable that minimal use will become standard use. The contractor who is appointed to the project will be allowed to use local roads and will not be able to stop sub-contractors using local roads.

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Alternatives have been identified which would avoid or minimise the use of local streets and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

Signed: 

**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: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]
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: 12 October 2017

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

- **Traffic and transport - spoil haulage routes (1)**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS which require that the Proponent must assess construction transport and traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and cyclists) impacts in relation to route identification and scheduling of transport movements, particularly outside standard construction hours.

The proponent has only provided indicative spoil haulage routes in relation to the proposed Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt. In 8.3.1 of the EIS the proponent states that 'Spoil haulage routes would be confirmed during detailed design.'

The proponent has not provided an assessment of each of the possible spoil haulage route options even though both SMC and RMS have discussed these with stakeholders prior to release of the EIS.

Spoil haulage has a high environmental impact and the failure to describe the impacts of each of the possible spoil haulage options is a serious defect in the EIS.

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

- **Traffic and transport - spoil haulage routes (2)**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS which require that the Proponent must assess construction transport and traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and cyclists) impacts in relation to route identification and scheduling of transport movements, particularly outside standard construction hours. I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to assess the impacts of all the spoil haulage routes to and from the site that SMC is considering. These include the option of staging trucks from Sydney Ports at James Craig Rd, creating an off-ramp from the City West Link near North Leichhardt Light Rail and running trucks

underground in established tunnels. These spoil haulage routes will have different impacts and the proponent is obliged to identify them. The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

- **Traffic and transport - spoil haulage routes (3)**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS which require that the Proponent must assess construction transport and traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and cyclists) impacts in relation to route identification and scheduling of transport movements, particularly outside standard construction hours.

The proponent only provides details of light and heavy vehicle volumes predicted to arrive and depart from construction ancillary facilities like the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt *during a typical AM peak hour, PM peak hour and daily period*. This is an insufficient amount of information about the impacts. It does not make it clear what the impacts will be during the course of the project. It does not make it clear what the impacts will be during non-typical hours and during nonpeak hours.

I am concerned that the proponent is understating the impact of vehicle volumes by only providing information on typical AM peak hour, PM peak hour and daily period. What is typical is a subjective assessment. Leichhardt might end up with greater vehicle volumes and greater impacts because the EIS has been approved on the basis of typical AM peak hour, PM peak hour and daily period. The proponent and its agent Sydney Motorway Corporation are already undertaking identical operations at other tunnelling locations for Stages 1 and 2 of WestConnex and should be able to provide more detail about what the vehicle volumes will be at each stage of the project.

The proponent should be in a position to provide more than just typical volumes and more than just peak hour volumes. The proponent should know how many vehicles will be arriving and departing from the site on an hourly basis at the various stages of the project. The proponent should describe what a typical day would look like hour by hour in terms of vehicle arrivals and departures at specific points in the project. The proponent should describe what a non-typical day would look like and what might cause a non-typical day to occur. I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to provide sufficient detail about vehicle volumes to enable a meaningful assessment of the impacts.

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



**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: [REDACTED]	
Address: [REDACTED]	
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: 12 October 2017

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

- **Traffic and transport - construction worker parking (1)**

**I object** to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has no proposal or plan to manage the impacts in relation to construction worker parking. The impacts are clearly foreseeable yet there is no plan.

In 8.3.1 of the EIS the proponent states that 'A number of the project's staff and labour force would be expected to drive to construction sites and would therefore require car parking.' And that 'It is anticipated that construction workforce parking would be primarily provided at the following sites: □ Northcote Street civil site (C3a) – around 150 car parking spaces (Option A) Parramatta Road East civil site (C3b) – around 140 car parking spaces (Option B) Rozelle civil and tunnel site (C5) – around 400 car parking spaces Campbell Road civil and tunnel site (C10) – around 150 car parking spaces. These facilities would be used to provide worker parking and shuttle bus transfers to other nearby construction sites.'

It is inevitable that the main contractor and sub-contractor workers at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt will not avail themselves of the parking sites and shuttle bus at these locations and that they will end up parking in streets near to the site. They will do this because it is more convenient for them to park in local streets.

**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.

- **Traffic and transport - construction worker parking (2)**

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.

- **Traffic and transport - construction worker parking (3)**

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 lead to residents being disturbed by workers parking in what are otherwise quiet residential streets.

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, which disturbed residents. Residents had to complain to Woolworths and to the contractor Flexem about worker parking on numerous occasions.

In 8.3.1 of the EIS the proponent admits that 'workers starting or ending shifts very early or very late would be more likely to use private vehicles.'

This means that such workers will end up parking on our local streets. The proponent fails to provide information about the times at which such late or early shifts start or end. Charles St, Hubert St and Francis St are quiet residential streets. Generally, in the evenings after 6.30 pm there is not a lot of parking activity or through traffic. The proponent should have disclosed when the shift workers will be arriving or departing.

The proponent should know this from its existing tunnelling activities at Stages 1 and 2 of the project.

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because residents will be disturbed by worker parking to an unacceptable extent.

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.

- **Traffic and transport - construction worker parking (4)**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS which require that the Proponent must assess construction transport and traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and cyclists) impacts in relation to the nature of existing traffic (types and number of movements) on construction access routes (including consideration of peak traffic times and sensitive road users and parking arrangements). In 8.3.1 of the EIS the proponent states that 'A car parking strategy would be developed as part of the Construction Traffic and Access Management Plan (CTAMP) to limit impacts on parking for the surrounding communities.' It is unacceptable to proceed with the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt without a parking plan in place. The proponent is already undertaking identical tunnelling activities as part of Stages 1 and 2 of the project and should be capable of providing a detailed worker parking strategy for the Darley Rd site based on its experience of similar sites with similar operations.

The proponent is not able to provide a plan for the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt however, because it knows it cannot limit impacts on parking for the surrounding communities. The local community has no confidence that an adequate plan will ever be in place for the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt. The experience of communities impacted by WestConnex worker parking at sites such as Northcote St Haberfield is that residents' complaints fall on deaf ears for a long time and that the responsible parties all refuse to take responsibility to solve the problem. Even when residents were able to get the Joint venture/SMC to agree to secure a worker parking site they have not taken effective action to make sure the workers actually used it. It appears that the proponent's plan for the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt is to do nothing about worker parking and to wait for residents to complain and then to hold out until they get complaint fatigue and give up complaining.

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.

- **Traffic and transport - construction worker parking (5)**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS which require that the Proponent must

assess construction transport and traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and cyclists) impacts in relation to the nature of existing traffic (types and number of movements) on construction access routes (including consideration of peak traffic times and sensitive road users and parking arrangements).

In 8.3.1 of the EIS the proponent states that a car parking strategy would be developed as part of the Construction Traffic and Access Management Plan (CTAMP) to limit impacts on parking for the surrounding communities.

'The car parking strategy would include items such as forecasting of construction parking demand, review of existing parking supply and use on local streets in the area, impact on existing parking, consultation activities and proposed mitigation measures, such as management of workforce parking and transport, alternative parking arrangements and communication and engagement. This would include the identification of areas where there are high levels of existing parking demand around the construction ancillary facilities and works sites and identifying alternative car parking sites for use by the construction workforce. Processes for monitoring, reporting and corrective actions would also be part of the strategy.'

The proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS because it simply has not bothered to come up with a plan for worker parking. It is not good enough or acceptable to leave residents in the dark about such a significant impact of the proposal for a Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt. With its existing and current experience of operating similar sites for Stages 1 and 2 of the project the proponent should present its proposed Construction Traffic and Access Management Plan (CTAMP) as part of the EIS.

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.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

A handwritten signature consisting of a stylized 'J' and a looped 'L' shape, followed by a horizontal line.

**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: [REDACTED]	
Address: [REDACTED]	
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: 12 October 2017



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

**Traffic and transport – new right hand turning lane on the City West Link to James St**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent is planning to create a right hand turning lane on the City West Link to allow construction vehicles to turn right into James Street.

This is a dangerous proposal given that it involves turning into a steep blind corner which carries a high degree of risk of collision with oncoming vehicles and with pedestrians including the many school children who cross James St at this point.

It is reckless beyond belief to plan for large number of truck and dogs to make a right -hand turn into James St from the City West Link. Even vehicles crossing the City West Link from the Lilyfield Rd side of the City West Link have a higher risk of collision or error due to the steep blind turn. This would be even higher when making a right hand turn into James St from the City West Link.

This intersection is reported as being the third most dangerous for accidents in the Inner West.

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because a right hand turning lane on the City West Link to allow construction vehicles to turn right into James Street creates an unacceptable risk of death and bodily injury due to collision.

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Safer alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

Signed: 

**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: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]
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: 12 October 2017

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

**Traffic and transport – hours of operation for spoil removal**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS which require that the Proponent must assess construction transport and traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and cyclists) impacts in relation to access constraints and impacts on public transport, pedestrians and cyclists.

The proponent's failure stems from its contradictory and inconsistent assessment of the impacts of spoil removal from the site. In 8.3.1 of the EIS the proponent states that 'Where practical, spoil would be removed during the day, outside of peak periods.'

This is completely at odds with the proponents own figures for heavy vehicle movements in peak hour. In Table 8-42 Indicative daily and peak period construction traffic volumes it is indicated that there will be 14 heavy vehicle movements in the AM and PM peak. This is a spoil truck movement every 4 minutes. If the EIS is approved as is then the proponent's contractor will be permitted to remove spoil during peak periods and would have no constraints on the number of truck movements per hour.

No doubt in order to complete the project on time the contractor will have the maximum number of truck movements possible regardless of the impact on residents. I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because spoil trucks on Darley Rd will create traffic congestion during peak times (which are in actual fact longer than the peak hours on which the proponent bases its analysis).

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because spoil trucks on Darley Rd will create traffic queues and will increase traffic through local streets. The proponent is the guardian of the road network and knows that this will be the result.

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

**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: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]
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: 12 October 2017

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

- **Contaminated site (1)**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

7 Darley Road is a site which has been reported to the NSW EPA under section 60 of the CLM Act. Although NSW EPA assessed the site as not requiring regulation under the CLM Act in 16.2.14 of the EIS the proponent sets out in Table 16-15 the contaminants of potential concern that are present at Darley Rd. These are metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, total recoverable hydrocarbons, asbestos and Volatile Organic Hydrocarbons (SVOCs).

The proponent's plan for the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt involves demolition, earthworks, construction and track-out (the transport of dust and dirt from the construction/demolition site onto the public road network on construction vehicles).

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of contaminants will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.

- **Contaminated site (2)**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable. The proponent rates contamination at this site as a medium risk yet the proponent's track record in managing these risks suggests otherwise.

- In April 2016 Marrickville Council voted to release confidential legal advice which suggested that WestConnex had been operating for months without any legal approval, including in the handling of toxic waste and asbestos.  
[\(http://www.southernthunderer.com.au/westconnex-acts-illegally-in-handling-of-toxic-waste-and-asbestos/\)](http://www.southernthunderer.com.au/westconnex-acts-illegally-in-handling-of-toxic-waste-and-asbestos/)
- In September 2016 it was reported by the ABC that a former employee of Sydney excavation company Moits, Daniel McIntyre, has claimed the company supplied asbestos-laden road base to the WestConnex project.  
[\(<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-09-01/asbestos-westconnex-allegations-labor-calls-for-works-to-stop/7803378>\)](http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-09-01/asbestos-westconnex-allegations-labor-calls-for-works-to-stop/7803378)
- In August 2017 it was reported by the Parramatta advertiser that Granville and Harris Park residents living in a hotspot asbestos dumping ground, who have been warned not to mow their lawns too short or dig in their back yards for fear of deadly contamination, say they are inhaling dust kicked up by WestConnex trucks.  
[\(<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/newslocal/parramatta/granville-and-harris-park-residents-fear-contamination-from-asbestos-from-dust-created-by-westconnex-trucks/news-story/853d43d153da6c5edeb64d1043b00c68>\)](http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/newslocal/parramatta/granville-and-harris-park-residents-fear-contamination-from-asbestos-from-dust-created-by-westconnex-trucks/news-story/853d43d153da6c5edeb64d1043b00c68)
- In August 2017 the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has fined WestConnex contractors CPB Contractors \$8,000 following an investigation into the emission of offensive odours at the St Peters Interchange worksite in March this year.  
<http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/epamedia/EPAMedia030817.htm>
- On numerous occasions in Campbell Street St Peters residents have observed inadequate and dangerous risk asbestos management practices by WestConnex contractors such as using hoses to damp down dust and material containing asbestos without wearing protective clothing.  
**I object** to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of asbestos and other contaminants will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.

- **Asbestos contaminated site (1)**

**I object** to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

Appendix R, 4.7.8 Areas and contaminants of concern the proponent states that 'There is also potential for asbestos to be present in the fill from potential uncontrolled filling and demolition of former buildings.'

The proponent's assessment is defective as it fails to identify the risk to local residents and anyone else in the neighbourhood of excavated soil containing contaminants and asbestos being blown into nearby streets and into homes and gardens of adjoining properties. The proponent's assessment is defective because having identified the presence of asbestos on the site it fails to specifically identify the potential for inhalation of asbestos either by workers or residents.

**I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of asbestos will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.**

- **Asbestos contaminated site (2)**

**I object** to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

The proponent in identifying the potential contamination impacts at Darley Road states that:

'Previous soil investigations identified fill material with slightly elevated metals and PAHs, although the site is still suitable for ongoing commercial/industrial land use. A UST has also been decommissioned. If present and not appropriately controlled, there is potential for:

- Direct contact, inhalation and ingestion risk to site workers from contaminated soil or hazardous building materials via dust
- Discharge of contaminated surface water to the stormwater system and ultimately Hawthorne Canal and Iron Cove
- Incorrect handling or disposal of spoil
- Disturbance of actual or potential acid sulphate soils at the western end of the site which could impact local soil and water quality.

The proponent's assessment is defective as it fails to identify the risk to local residents and anyone else in the neighbourhood of excavated soil containing contaminants and asbestos being blown into nearby streets and into homes and gardens of adjoining properties. The proponent's assessment is defective because having identified the presence of asbestos on the site it fails to specifically identify the potential for inhalation of asbestos either by workers or residents.

**I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of asbestos and other contaminants will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be a stylized 'S' or a similar character, is written over the line provided for signing.

**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: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]
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: 12 October 2017

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

- **Dust emission from construction activities**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

The proponent appears to downplay the impact of dust emission from construction activities by stating that '**It is difficult to reliably quantify dust emissions from construction activities. Due to the variability of the weather it is impossible to predict what the weather conditions would be when specific construction activities are undertaken**'.

This is an astonishing statement given the fact that the proponent is undertaking identical construction activities at numerous other sites as part of Stages 1 and 2 of the project. The proponent should by now be able to reduce any risks and impacts to zero in all-weather circumstances. The proponent has failed to demonstrate that it is capable of managing risks that are capable of being managed and its proposals for the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt should be rejected on this basis.

The proponent appears to downplay the impact of dust emission from construction activities further by stating that 'Any effects of construction on airborne particle concentrations would also generally be temporary and relatively short-lived.' This is also an astonishing statement given that a consequence of even one exposure to asbestos is fatal lung disease, not to mention the risk to children and adults with asthma. One asthma attack can result in death.

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because it creates an unacceptable risk to the health of workers and residents due to the dust impacts from demolition and construction and in addition will cause loss of amenity to residents.



Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

**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: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]
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: 12 October 2017

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 vibration 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".

**The Department of Planning and Environment should require** the proponent to adopt the approach taken by the Crossrail project in the UK which is to publish the noise mitigation policy before the project begins and to identify who will be entitled to mitigation. It is unacceptable that all of these negative impacts have been identified, inadequate

mitigation proposed and little effort made to plan as to how these impacts will be managed throughout the project.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

A handwritten signature consisting of a stylized, cursive line that loops back on itself, ending with a small circle.

**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: [REDACTED]	
Address: [REDACTED]	
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: [REDACTED]	Date: 12 October 2017

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.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

**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: [REDACTED]	
Address: [REDACTED]	
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: 12 October 2017
	

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

- **Air quality – exhaust emissions (1)**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable. In particular I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site because of the impact it will have on health.

In 9.3 'Construction assessment methodology' of the EIS the proponent states that one of the main air pollution and amenity considerations at demolition/construction sites is increased concentrations of airborne particles and NO<sub>2</sub> due to exhaust emissions from on-site diesel-powered vehicles and construction equipment. In 9.3 the proponent also states that '**Exhaust emissions from on-site plant and site traffic are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality, and in the majority of cases they would not need to be quantitatively assessed.**'

This assessment is incorrect in the case of the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site in Leichhardt and the Department of Planning must require the proponent to submit an assessment.

The proponent sets out elsewhere in the EIS its plan to run spoil trucks in and out of the site via Darley Rd/James St.

A full laden truck and dog driving up the steep blind section of Darley Rd/James St will have to use high gears and high revs to get up the hill. This will take longer than for other vehicles because of the size of a truck and dog and the extensive traffic queuing that takes place at the intersection. The proponent anticipates there being a truck every 4 minutes in peak hour which coincides with the peak of foot traffic near the intersection. This means a truck every traffic light cycle. This will create unacceptable concentrations of diesel exhaust in an area used by a lot of pedestrians to get to and from the North Leichhardt light rail stop.

The Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site in Leichhardt should not be allowed to proceed because of the health impacts from diesel exhaust.

- **Air quality – exhaust emissions (2)**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable. In particular I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site because of the impact it will have on health.

Many school children alight from the light rail at this stop to get to Sydney Secondary College Leichhardt Campus. Many school children board the light rail at this stop to get to the Blackwattle Bay campus, St Scholastica's and other schools along the light rail. Many school children who attend Orange Grove Public School, Lilyfield cross the City West Link here.

These pedestrians and school children will be forced to inhale diesel fumes containing dangerous fine particulate matter day in, day out, for years. No other WestConnex Civil and Tunnel Construction site brings pedestrians and school children directly into daily contact spoil trucks and their dangerous diesel emissions. The Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site in Leichhardt should not be allowed to proceed because of the health impacts from diesel exhaust.

- **Air quality – exhaust emissions (3)**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to minimise the risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable. The proponent has the option of doing without a tunnel construction site at this location either by not having a mid-point dive site or by selecting one of the alternative locations which have been identified and which allow for trucks to enter directly from the City West Link and which are well away from pedestrians and school children.

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the risk it will create of inhalation of fine particulate matter from diesel exhaust. The Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt should not be allowed to proceed because of the risk caused by diesel fumes from spoil trucks at the intersection of James St with the City West Link.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

**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: [REDACTED]	
Address: [REDACTED]	
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: [REDACTED]	Date: 12 October 2017

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

#### **Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction - Traffic**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact it will have on traffic, parking and local residences. The grounds on which I am objecting were also the grounds for rejecting a previous development on this site, which was only approved by the Land and Environment Court with strict conditions.

On 5 December 2006 the Building & Development Council of Leichhardt Council refused Development Application D/2006/311 in relation to 7 Darley Road, which was an application for alterations and additions to existing building and change of use of existing building for use as a liquor store, cafe/deli and commercial office space, new landscaping and signage. Hundreds of local residents had lodged objections to the DA. One of the grounds on which the application was refused was that the RTA did not support the access arrangements and would not allow right hand turns into the site, which is precisely what the proponent is now proposing. The following extract from the decision sets out why the RTA objected to the DA:

"The application has proposed a number of traffic management measures along Darley Road, included painted median islands.

The RTA does not support the access arrangements as proposed and has advised that it is likely to create conflicts at the shared entry/exit near Hubert Street. It has been recommended that there be separate entry and exit driveways, with the entry nearest to Charles Street, and the exit at the driveway crossing near Hubert Street.

The RTA has advised that these driveways must be physically restricted with left-in/left-out movements through the provision of 900mm wide concrete median islands, covering the width of each driveway and extend to a distance of 10 metres either side of each driveway crossing. The parking area along the eastern section of the site must also be restricted to left-in/left-out movements.

On the advice of the RTA, no right-turn into the site is then possible, potentially encouraging west-bound traffic on Darley Road to conduct 'U-turns' at the Charles Street intersection to access the carpark, creating a conflict at that point.

Council's engineers have advised that the proposed traffic management works on the Darley Street frontage have a number of deficiencies including:

- Traffic lanes on the southern side of Darley Street would be relocated onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- The proposed kerbside traffic lane on the southern side of Darley Street would conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures. Significant drainage works would be required to address this issue without exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.

Advice from the RTA has also noted the unsuitability of the existing kerbside parking and bicycle lanes for a through lane due to its cross-fall. The RTA have further advised that the bicycle lane along Darley Road must be retained, and that no objections are raised to the proposed pedestrian refuge, subject to compliance with the relevant Australian standards. "The RTA also raised objections in relation to traffic that the bottle shop development would generate:

"It is expected that the peak traffic generation periods for the development would be Friday evenings and Saturdays, with Thursday evening also busy. Conflict with the morning peak hour is therefore expected to be limited. It is noted that the traffic surveys were conducted prior to the closure of Moore Street West, Leichhardt.

Anecdotal evidence has suggested that traffic flow has increased on east-west thoroughfares such as Darley Road and Marion Street since the closure.

Traffic generation figures supplied in the traffic report initially submitted to Council were derived strictly from the amount of carparking provided on the site.

The revised traffic generation figures provided as a result of the additional parking provided on the site. It has factored that 35% of traffic to the site are passing trips. It has not accounted for spill-over traffic that cannot be accommodated on the site.

These figures would appear to conflict with statement within the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) that was submitted to the LAB for approval. This document indicates that the 'catchment' for the proposed liquor outlet is considerably larger and it states "In contrast Dan Murphy's OLR's are larger format destination stores designed to appeal to a regional market ..."

It has also been noted that the proposed liquor store alone would expect up to sixty (60) deliveries a week.

The study derives that the likely additional traffic on the local network would be:

- Thursday evening – some 150 vehicles/hour (in + out)
- Friday evening - some 156 vehicles/hour (in + out)
- midday - some 228 vehicles/hour (in + out)

Of particular concern in this regard is that the 'No stopping' restriction required by the RTA for the northern side of Darley Road during the Thursday and Friday evening peaks, which may funnel overflow parking into the surrounding residential streets. Furthermore, the substantial increase in traffic flow at the Saturday peak may result in significant queuing at the City-West intersection as all vehicles are forced to left-turn exiting the site.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered unsatisfactory when having regard to traffic and parking impacts."

It is clear that the same traffic impacts raised by the RTA will be a consequence of the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these. The proponent's plan to bring 100 trucks a day into the site will result in significant queuing at the City-West intersection yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these.

The removal of 20 parking spaces Darley Rd and the absence of a worker parking plan will funnel overflow parking into the surrounding residential streets which are already at parking capacity yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these.

The following points of concern were also raised in the Council's rejection of the bottle shop DA:

"Traffic and parking impact on Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network/ vehicular – pedestrian conflict, especially with school children/ increase noise from traffic movements and truck loading and unloading.

The increase in traffic movements to the site are likely to have an undue acoustic impact on the dwellings located opposite site, particularly as a result of late-night movements.

The proponent has failed to adequately address the fact that the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt will have the same impacts of:

- Traffic and parking impact on Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network
- vehicular – pedestrian conflict, especially with school children/
- increase noise from traffic movements and truck loading and unloading.

The proponent has failed to address the fact that the increase in traffic movements to the site are likely to have an undue acoustic impact on the dwellings located opposite site, particularly as a result of late-night movements. The proponent plans to have workers on site 24 / 7. Late night and out of hours comings and goings by vehicle are to be expected yet the proponent has failed to address the impact of these vehicle movements on local residents.

**The site should not be permitted to operate outside of standard constructions hours because of the noise impacts from construction vehicles, delivery vehicles and worker transportation vehicles.** The following Traffic Management deficiencies were also raised in the Council's rejection of the bottle shop DA:

"The proposed Traffic Management works on the Darley Road frontage have a number of deficiencies including:

- (a) Traffic lanes on the southern side of Darley Road would be relocated onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- (b) The proposed kerbside traffic lane on the southern side of Darley Road would conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures. Significant drainage works would be required to address this issue without exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.

- (c) The access arrangement for the parking area on the western side of the site will create traffic conflict at the shared entry/exit driveway near Hubert Street.
- (d) The application would result in the loss of on-street parking spaces on the southern side of Darley Road.
- (e) The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the traffic management proposal complies with the RTA requirements for works on a State Road.
- (f) The site plans do not adequately address internal vehicle manoeuvring for large trucks accessing the 2 loading docks.
- (g) The application has failed to demonstrate how the existing bicycle lane would be maintained.

The application has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an undue increase in traffic generation along Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network.

- (a) The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated assumptions made in their report regarding parking demand and traffic generation.
- (b) The traffic generation assumption for passing or redistributed trips is not validated.
- (c) The design does not adequately address the impacts from vehicle queuing in Darley Road."

The same deficiencies are present in the proponent's EIS and the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt should be rejected on the same grounds:

- construction trucks travelling on the southern side of Darley Road will force traffic onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- the construction works will conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures which will exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.
- The access arrangement for the site will create traffic conflict at the shared entry/exit driveway near Hubert Street.
- The application would result in the loss of on-street parking spaces on the southern side of Darley Road.
- There is no traffic management proposal.
- The proponent has failed to demonstrate how the existing bicycle lane would be maintained.
- The proponent has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an undue increase in traffic generation along Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network.
- The proponent has failed to adequately address the impacts from vehicle queuing in Darley Road."

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

**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: [REDACTED]	
Address: [REDACTED]	
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: [REDACTED]	Date: 12 October 2017

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

#### **Impact of MOC1 on local area**

I oppose the plan for a water treatment plant and an electrical substation to remain on the site of 7 Darley Rd Leichhardt after tunnel construction is complete.

This Motorway Operations Centre 1 (MOC1) is a completely inappropriate use of a site in a residential area with particular characteristics.

The character of Leichhardt is heavily influenced by the street pattern (predominantly north/south extending from Parramatta Road) and built form. The wide carriageways and regular street pattern combined with the topography and a predominance of single storey detached housing gives Leichhardt a more open character than that of Glebe or Annandale. The suburb is made up of several distinctive residential neighbourhoods including Excelsior Estate, Helsarmel, Piperston and West Leichhardt. The subject site is within the Helsarmel Distinctive Neighbourhood that is located on the northwest slope of the Leichhardt/Balmain ridge. The Helsarmel Distinctive Neighbourhood is predominated by low scale detached and semi-detached cottages that demonstrated a variety of architectural styles and building materials. Many of these dwellings are Federation or post-war styles, with scattered examples of Californian bungalows and workers cottages.

The desired future character as set out by Council is to maintain the character of the neighbourhood by keeping development complementary in architectural style, form and materials and preserve the low scale cottage character. The suburb profile allows for contemporary development that is complementary to the streetscape.

The MOC1 proposal for a tunnel water treatment plant and an electrical substation is inconsistent with the character of the neighbourhood. This is a residential neighbourhood and what is proposed will permanently degrade our neighbourhood. MOC1 will be a prominent and unwelcome eyesore.

**The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt and the proposed Motorway Operations Centre 1. The proponent should identify alternatives locations for water treatment and a substation including at the alternative dive site locations. The proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.**

**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:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED]
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:	[REDACTED]      Date: 12 October 2017

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 ensure that the conditions of any approval are stringent and should require the proponent to pay a pre-determined amount of**

Submission from:	Submission to:
Name:..... <u>NEIL GREENSTREET</u> .....	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature:..... 	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <b>include / exclude (circle)</b> 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.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address: <u>29 HILL STREET</u>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb: <u>LEICHHARDT NSW</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>	

**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**

#### **Jobs created:**

- (1) 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)

#### **Heritage impacts:**

- (2) The project directly affects 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)

#### **Property acquisition support service:**


- (3) 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)

#### **Biodiversity:**

- (4) The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.

#### **Visual amenity:**

- (5) 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)

<p>Submission from:</p> <p>Name:..... <u>NEIL GREENSTREET</u> .....</p> <p>Signature: </p> <p><i>Please <u>include</u> / <u>exclude</u> (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></p> <p>Address: ..... <u>59 HILL STREET</u> .....</p> <p>Suburb: <u>LEICHHARDT NSW</u> Postcode <u>2040</u></p>	<p>Submission to:</p> <p>Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Attn: Director – Transport Assessments</p> <p>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>
---	---

**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 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 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ The EIS indicates that residents will be subjected to severe noise impacts for up to 4 months, caused by the long-term construction work proposed for this site which includes 8 weeks to demolish buildings, followed by 6 weeks to establish construction facilities, with pavement and infrastructure works required (EIS, 10-112) The EIS contains limited mitigation proposed to manage such impacts.
- ❖ Despite setting out the noise impacts of construction at this site, the lowest grade acoustic shed is proposed as mitigation. The EIS states that the Acoustic shed performance should be 'upgraded' and the site hoarding increased to 4 metres 'in select areas.' (EIS, 10-119). No detail is provided as to how effectively these enhancements will manage the noise and vibration impacts of construction.
- ❖ 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 possible to limit the use of the road profiler. This represents an inadequate response to managing these severe noise impacts for residents.

**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: <i>ADEN WATSON</i>	Address: 10 PERTONIA ST	Suburb / TOWN: LYNNFIELD
Post Code: 2040		
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: <i>Aden Watson</i>	Date 26/09/2017	

### Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction - Traffic

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact it will have on traffic, parking and local residences. The grounds on which I am objecting were also the grounds for rejecting a previous development on this site, which was only approved by the Land and Environment Court with strict conditions.

On 5 December 2006 the Building & Development Council of Leichhardt Council refused Development Application D/2006/311 in relation to 7 Darley Road, which was an application for alterations and additions to existing building and change of use of existing building for use as a liquor store, cafe/deli and commercial office space, new landscaping and signage. Hundreds of local residents had lodged objections to the DA. One of the grounds on which the application was refused was that the RTA did not support the access arrangements and would not allow right hand turns into the site, which is precisely what the proponent is now proposing. The following extract from the decision sets out why the RTA objected to the DA:

"The application has proposed a number of traffic management measures along Darley Road, included painted median islands.

The RTA does not support the access arrangements as proposed and has advised that it is likely to create conflicts at the shared entry/exit near Hubert Street. It has been recommended that there be separate entry and exit driveways, with the entry nearest to Charles Street, and the exit at the driveway crossing near Hubert Street.

The RTA has advised that these driveways must be physically restricted with left-in/left-out movements through the provision of 900mm wide concrete median islands, covering the width of each driveway and extend to a distance of 10 metres either side of each driveway crossing. The parking area along the eastern section of the site must also be restricted to left-in/left-out movements.

On the advice of the RTA, no right-turn into the site is then possible, potentially encouraging west-bound traffic on Darley Road to conduct 'U-turns' at the Charles Street intersection to access the carpark, creating a conflict at that point.

Council's engineers have advised that the proposed traffic management works on the Darley Street frontage have a number of deficiencies including:

- Traffic lanes on the southern side of Darley Street would be relocated onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- The proposed kerbside traffic lane on the southern side of Darley Street would conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures. Significant drainage works would be required to address this issue without exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.

Advice from the RTA has also noted the unsuitability of the existing kerbside parking and bicycle lanes for a through lane due to its cross-fall. The RTA have further advised that the bicycle lane along Darley Road must be retained, and that no objections are raised to the proposed pedestrian refuge, subject to compliance with the relevant Australian standards. "The RTA also raised objections in relation to traffic that the bottle shop development would generate:

"It is expected that the peak traffic generation periods for the development would be Friday evenings and Saturdays, with Thursday evening also busy. Conflict with the morning peak hour is therefore expected to be limited. It is noted that the traffic surveys were conducted prior to the closure of Moore Street West, Leichhardt.

Anecdotal evidence has suggested that traffic flow has increased on east-west thoroughfares such as Darley Road and Marion Street since the closure.

Traffic generation figures supplied in the traffic report initially submitted to Council were derived strictly from the amount of carparking provided on the site.

The revised traffic generation figures provided as a result of the additional parking provided on the site. It has factored that 35% of traffic to the site are passing trips. It has not accounted for spill-over traffic that cannot be accommodated on the site.

These figures would appear to conflict with statement within the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) that was submitted to the LAB for approval. This document indicates that the 'catchment' for the proposed liquor outlet is considerably larger and it states "In contrast Dan Murphy's OLR's are larger format destination stores designed to appeal to a regional market ..."

It has also been noted that the proposed liquor store alone would expect up to sixty (60) deliveries a week.

The study derives that the likely additional traffic on the local network would be:

- Thursday evening – some 150 vehicles/hour (in + out)
- Friday evening - some 156 vehicles/hour (in + out)
- midday - some 228 vehicles/hour (in + out)

Of particular concern in this regard is that the 'No stopping' restriction required by the RTA for the northern side of Darley Road during the Thursday and Friday evening peaks, which may funnel overflow parking into the surrounding residential streets. Furthermore, the substantial increase in traffic flow at the Saturday peak may result in significant queuing at the City-West intersection as all vehicles are forced to left-turn exiting the site.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered unsatisfactory when having regard to traffic and parking impacts."

It is clear that the same traffic impacts raised by the RTA will be a consequence of the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these. The proponent's plan to bring 100 trucks a day into the site will result in significant queuing at the City-West intersection yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these.

The removal of 20 parking spaces Darley Rd and the absence of a worker parking plan will funnel overflow parking into the surrounding residential streets which are already at parking capacity yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these.

The following points of concern were also raised in the Council's rejection of the bottle shop DA:

"Traffic and parking impact on Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network/ vehicular – pedestrian conflict, especially with school children/ increase noise from traffic movements and truck loading and unloading.

The increase in traffic movements to the site are likely to have an undue acoustic impact on the dwellings located opposite site, particularly as a result of late-night movements.

The proponent has failed to adequately address the fact that the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt will have the same impacts of:

- Traffic and parking impact on Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network
- vehicular – pedestrian conflict, especially with school children/
- increase noise from traffic movements and truck loading and unloading.

The proponent has failed to address the fact that the increase in traffic movements to the site are likely to have an undue acoustic impact on the dwellings located opposite site, particularly as a result of late-night movements. The proponent plans to have workers on site 24 / 7. Late night and out of hours comings and goings by vehicle are to be expected yet the proponent has failed to address the impact of these vehicle movements on local residents.

**The site should not be permitted to operate outside of standard constructions hours because of the noise impacts from construction vehicles, delivery vehicles and worker transportation vehicles.** The following Traffic Management deficiencies were also raised in the Council's rejection of the bottle shop DA:

"The proposed Traffic Management works on the Darley Road frontage have a number of deficiencies including:

- (a) Traffic lanes on the southern side of Darley Road would be relocated onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- (b) The proposed kerbside traffic lane on the southern side of Darley Road would conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures. Significant drainage works would be required to address this issue without exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.

- (c) The access arrangement for the parking area on the western side of the site will create traffic conflict at the shared entry/exit driveway near Hubert Street.
- (d) The application would result in the loss of on-street parking spaces on the southern side of Darley Road.
- (e) The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the traffic management proposal complies with the RTA requirements for works on a State Road.
- (f) The site plans do not adequately address internal vehicle manoeuvring for large trucks accessing the 2 loading docks.
- (g) The application has failed to demonstrate how the existing bicycle lane would be maintained.

The application has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an undue increase in traffic

generation along Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network.

- (a) The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated assumptions made in their report regarding parking demand and traffic generation.
- (b) The traffic generation assumption for passing or redistributed trips is not validated.
- (c) The design does not adequately address the impacts from vehicle queuing in Darley Road.”

The same deficiencies are present in the proponent's EIS and the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt should be rejected on the same grounds:

- construction trucks travelling on the southern side of Darley Road will force traffic onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- the construction works will conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures which will exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.
- The access arrangement for the site will create traffic conflict at the shared entry/exit driveway near Hubert Street.
- The application would result in the loss of on-street parking spaces on the southern side of Darley Road.
- There is no traffic management proposal.
- The proponent has failed to demonstrate how the existing bicycle lane would be maintained.
- The proponent has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an undue increase in traffic generation along Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network.
- The proponent has failed to adequately address the impacts from vehicle queuing in Darley Road.”

**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: <i>ANNE MASSY</i>	Address: 10 PACTUARIA ST Post Code 2040	Suburb LINY FIELD
-------------------------	--	-------------------

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: *ANNE MASSY* Date *26/10/2017*

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

- **Contaminated site**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

7 Darley Road is a site which has been reported to the NSW EPA under section 60 of the CLM Act. Although NSW EPA assessed the site as not requiring regulation under the CLM Act in 16.2.14 of the EIS the proponent sets out in Table 16-15 the contaminants of potential concern that are present at Darley Rd. These are metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, total recoverable hydrocarbons, asbestos and Volatile Organic Hydrocarbons (SVOCs).

The proponent's plan for the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt involves demolition, earthworks, construction and track-out (the transport of dust and dirt from the construction/demolition site onto the public road network on construction vehicles).

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of contaminants will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.


- **Asbestos contaminated site**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

Appendix R, 4.7.8 Areas and contaminants of concern the proponent states that 'There is also potential for asbestos to be present in the fill from potential uncontrolled filling and demolition of former buildings.'

The proponent's assessment is defective as it fails to identify the risk to local residents and anyone else in the neighbourhood of excavated soil containing contaminants and asbestos being blown into nearby streets and into homes and gardens of adjoining properties. The proponent's assessment is defective because having identified the presence of asbestos on the site it fails to specifically identify the potential for inhalation of asbestos either by workers or residents.

**I object** to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of asbestos will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: PAULO JUNIOR
	Address: 103/9 GREENKNOWE AVE
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: Potts Point Postcode 2011
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
<p>Please include// delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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 \_\_\_\_\_

23.9.17

**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: SWANBY GREGORY

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.

Date: 22/9/17

Address: 108 Hawthorne Pde

Suburb: HABERFIELD

Postcode: 2045

**I OBJECT TO THIS Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). My reasons are as follows.**

There is a lack of strategic justification for the project. No feasible alternatives have been developed or assessed.

This EIS is a strategy-only document. It does not commit to any design and it therefore does not address any local impacts created by the proposed M4-M5 Link. Instead, it prepares the pathway for the sale of the Sydney Motorway Corporation (SMC) to the private sector, which would remove from the Government the responsibility, oversight and control of the final design, cost and implementation of the M4-M5 Link.

Importantly, the M4-M5 Link fails to meet the primary objectives of providing a direct motorway connection between Western Sydney and Sydney Airport and Port Botany.

While the Rozelle Interchange is supposed to be opened in December 2023, the design is so preliminary and so complex (and would be incredibly expensive if it were to proceed) that it should be treated as a separate stage of the project to ensure that potential private sector funders are willing to invest in it.

There will be major impacts on the Anzac Bridge (projected 60% increase in daily traffic) and the CBD. The EIS forecasts major impacts on bus travel times and reliability.

The EIS does not adequately account for impacts on health and air quality. Very concerningly, it identifies an additional five (5) unfiltered ventilation stacks to be constructed in Rozelle/Lilyfield. Additionally, local surface roads will be widened and traffic volumes will increase - with associated increased air quality risks.

In summary, the EIS treats the public - our communities - with contempt. It offers no final design, no commitment to improved transport and only vague and unreliable traffic modelling.

If the M4-M5 Link proceeds, the people of the affected inner west suburbs - and indeed in wider Sydney - will have a highly destructive, intrusive motorway that escalating tolls will make extremely unpopular, and therefore avoided wherever possible. In turn, this will inevitably create traffic congestion in smaller, local streets.

I believe the real purpose of this EIS is to get NSW Government approval so that the opportunity to design, build, operate, maintain and put a toll on the road can be sold to private investors - a process completely outside of the scrutiny of the public (taxpayers) who will bear the ill-effects on their various communities for decades to come.

**I call on the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this entire EIS and re-write it prior to any further work on the other sections of WestConnex continuing.**


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 this process!

Name: SWANLEY GREGORY

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: 108 Hawthorne Rd

Suburb: HAWTHORNE FIELD Postcode: 2046

I have tried to make sense of this confused unclear document and am still puzzled. Here are my objections:

1. 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 though 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.
2. 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.
3. 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 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.
4. 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.
5. 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 27 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.
6. 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.
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. 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. 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 innercity area. Further, Buruwan Park lies on a major cycle route from Railway Parade through to Anzac Bridge, IJTS and the CBD.
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.
10. 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 minuscule. 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..

23.9.17

003826-M00002

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: SMARKEY GREGORY

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: 108 Hawthorne Pde

Suburb: HAWTHORNE

Postcode: 2045

This document is vague, lacking in detail confusing and confused. Here are my objections:

1. 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 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.
2. 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.
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 27 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 sustain serious structural damage and cracking.
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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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' children will be unaware that they are being poisoned.
9. 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 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.

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

Name: ..... *Rose Gymer*  
 Signature: *JMP*

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: ..... *13/21 MYRA RD*  
 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


Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- 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 ?
- 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.
- 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.
- 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*

---

**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: DANICA PRATAO.
	Address: 70-71 RIGNETT RL.
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: CECIL PARK Postcode 2178
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
<p>Please include/<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> delete/<input type="checkbox"/> cross out or circle my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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	Name: Shirley Fanshaw Signature:  Please <u>include</u> / <u>delete</u> ( <u>cross out or circle</u> ) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. <b>Declaration:</b> I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the late 2 years.
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Address: 72 Styles Street
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: Leichhardt NSW Postcode: 2040

I object to the Westconnex M4-M5 link proposals as contained in the EIS for the following reasons:

1. 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 responsibility for the design and construction. It also endeavours to lock out the public from being able to have any say in what is built, how it is built and where it is built.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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 almost opposite Rozelle Primary School. 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. Recently built tunnels in Tokyo successfully filter 98% of all pollutants. There are at least 5 schools and childcare centres in close proximity to these pollution stacks.
5. 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 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2017
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. Fine particulate matter is linked with Asthma, Lung Disease, Cancer, Stroke and poor lung development in children. Those most at risk are the old, the young and the unborn of pregnant women.
7. The Rozelle Rail Yard stacks are stated to be 38m high and are situated in a valley area. The majority of Balmain Road is 39m above sea level and Annandale St is at 29m above sea level. Both are considerably less than 1 kilometre from the Rail Yard stacks so pollution will be blown directly into many homes in these areas. This will expose the residents of Annandale, Lilyfield, Rozelle and Balmain to highly increased health risks.
8. There will be major impacts on the Anzac Bridge with a projected increase of 60% in daily traffic. There will also be major impacts to the Sydney City Centre. The EIS states that this will lead to major impacts on bus travel time and reliability. The EIS's suggests that people will have to adjust their travel times to starting for work earlier and finishing later. This is unacceptable and underlines Westconnex's waste and total failure.

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:.....*Grania Hickley*.....

Signature:.....*gk*.....

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:.....*1 Maudie 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 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: <u>Thomas Cope</u>
	Address: <u>Zoo The Ridge</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Helensburgh</u> Postcode <u>2508</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>
<p>Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	


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. There is great concern in the community that King Street, Newtown, will become a 24-hour clearway. The EIS at 7-41 acknowledges that, and states "Roads and Maritime has no plan to change the existing clearways on King Street". This statement is **deliberately misleading** as it infers that SMC has the authority to establish Clearways 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.
2. The EIS uses maps indicating alignment of the mainline tunnels. It is only when you get to EIS 12-57 (Sydney Water Tunnels) that it becomes clear 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 only 'indicative' and are misleading the community. The EIS should be withdrawn, corrected and updated, and reissued for genuine public comment based on 'definitive' information.
3. The EIS refers to concerns that were raised by the community that the route of tunnels in Newtown appeared to go to the east of King Street, an area that had had no geotech testing (see at 7-51) 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. The details in the just released EIS indicate both sides of King St but as it is only indicative how is it possible to comment on the likely impacts. This seriously casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
4. I strongly object to the way the EIS treats "uncertainties". EIS 6.1 (Synthesis, Page 45) describes the process re project uncertainties. *"The EIS is based on the concept design developed for the project. ... 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 ... 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"*. Given this I strongly object to the approval of this EIS until critical 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.
5. At 7-25 the EIS 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.
6. It is 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.
7. 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.

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: \_\_\_\_\_

<p>Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p>	<p>Name: JACK SAMPLEAM Signature: </p>
<p>Attention: Director – Transport Assessments</p>	<p>Please include / delete (cross out or circle) 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.</p>
<p>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Address: 3156 SUSAN ST Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode 2042</p>


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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. 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.
- 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.
- Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.
- 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.
- Other Comments I would like to make :

---

**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: Brian Somerville
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Signature: 
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	<i>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>
	Address: 300 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: Brian Somerville Signature: 
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	<small>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.</small>
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Address: 300 Glewch 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

- The project will worsen traffic near the Darley Road civil and tunnel site during and after construction – Leichhardt: 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 pedestrians.
- Impact on traffic once project opens – Leichhardt: The EIS provides that Darley Road traffic will increase by 4% following the completion of the project in 2022. There is no benefit for residents flowing from this project. It is unacceptable that Leichhardt residents, particularly those close to Darley Road, will be forced to endure years of highly intrusive construction impacts and then derive no benefit from the project. The EIS states that the road network will improve once the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link opens, which means that residents will have to endure worsened traffic conditions for up to 10 years. While the traffic on the City West Link is forecast to decrease by up to 40 per cent once the project is completed, this is based on commuters electing to use the tollways. There is limited evidence to support these statistics and it is likely that many people will choose to use local roads to avoid the toll which will result in significant rat-running. There is no plan in the EIS to manage this issue.
- Constant out of hours work expected and permitted – Leichhardt: 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).

---

**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 \_\_\_\_\_

<p>Submission to : Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p>	<p>Name: Brian Somerville Signature: </p>
<p>Attention: Director – Transport Assessments</p>	<p><i>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></p>
<p>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p>	<p>Address: 300 Elswick St Nth Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040</p>


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	Name: Brian Somerville
Attention: Director – Transport Assessments	Signature: 
Application Number: SSI 7485 Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Please <u>include</u> 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: 300 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

- Unacceptable construction noise levels – Leichhardt: 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 Murphys 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 uninhabitable and there are NO additional mitigation plans for these residents.
- Risk of settlement (ground movement) – Leichhardt: 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.
- Impact on Dobroyd Canal and Hawthorne Canal – Leichhardt: The Hawthorne canal, which is the closest waterway to the Darley Road site, is described in the EIS as a 'sensitive receiving environment'. (Executive Summary, xix). Darley Road is a contaminated site with asbestos and the water treatment plant to be established during construction proposes running water from the treatment plant directly into the waterways. The permanent water treatment plant will involve water from the tunnel discharged to local stormwater systems and waterways, therefore this is a permanent impact. This proposal will further compromise the quality of the waterway and impact on the four rowing clubs in close vicinity.
- Noise barriers: 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 \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 07:30:11 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Rachael Davern of Mrs (object)  
**Attachments:** 228066\_Westconnex EIS Submission \_2\_\_2017Oct16\_1325.pdf

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfRachael Davern  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 1:26:16 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Rachael Davern of Mrs (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Rachael Davern  
Organisation: Mrs (2039)  
Email: rach.davern@gmail.com

Address:  
81 Denison St

Rozelle, NSW  
2039

Content:  
Please see my attached letter outlining my objection to the project, the EIS process and several aspects of the EIS

IP Address: 124-171-21-118.dyn.iinet.net.au - 124.171.21.118  
Submission: Online Submission from Rachael Davern of Mrs (object)  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228066](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228066)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

16th October 2017

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

To Whom it May Concern,

**RE: Application number SSI 16-7485, WestConnex M4/M5 Link, EIS Submission**

**I strongly object to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link (the "Project") proposal in its entirety and urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to refuse the application on the grounds below.** NSW Planning must require the Proponent to properly and adequately address the impacts set out below which are not adequately addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS"). NSW Planning should reject this EIS and instead recommend to the NSW government that there should be an independent review of WestConnex before more billions are spent and more residents' lives are damaged. I am absolutely flabbergasted that for a project of this costs, the public has been shown no meaningful analysis of alternatives. The benefit ratios presented in the EIS are based on flawed assumptions and it seems this project requires approval of other future projects such as the Sydney Gateway and the Western Harbour Tunnel to avoid traffic chaos on the Anzac Bridge and in Botany / Mascot and to make any economic sense.

**I also object to the EIS on the grounds that it fails the Secretary's requirement for "meaningful" consultation.** Hundreds of submissions on the concept design, including a major one from my own Inner West Council, were ignored. Consultation is not the provision of glossy brochures which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a 'plan'. Nor is it bombarding the public with thousands of pages in an EIS which many of them cannot even understand where the details of shallow tunnels, ground settlement and night time noise are almost impossible to decipher. My Rozelle neighbours were completely unaware of the shallow tunnels beneath them and their impact until I felt the need to act and educate them by starting a neighbourhood petition. This is completely unfair and unacceptable given the impact on the value of our properties and the next 5 years of our lives.

This Project personally impacts me in several ways:

1. I live at 81 Denison St, Rozelle, in very close proximity to the proposed Rozelle Rail Yards construction site, tunnelling and exhaust ventilation facilities.
2. My eldest son attends Rozelle Public Primary School, in close proximity to the proposed Victoria Rd ventilation stacks; and

3. My youngest son attends Billy Kids Early Learning Centre, in close proximity to the proposed Darley Rd construction site.

Should the project proceed, I particularly object to the following points which have not been adequately addressed by the EIS document or the Project design:

- 1. The Western Harbour Tunnel (“WHT”) connections in the Rozelle Interchange must be redesigned to reduce the negative impact on residents above them due to shallow (~10m) tunnelling**

The proposed 10m deep tunnels beneath my property at 81 Denison St, Rozelle are particularly concerning given they are from the surface at the City West Link to the future WHT and I was told at the Balmain Town Hall community consultation that they are part of this project because “we want to get all tunnelling under your properties done now so you don’t suffer the inconvenience of tunnelling as part of that project too”. I strongly object to this rationale on the basis that they are proposed to be at a disturbingly shallow depth of less than 10m (EIS pg 6-25) underneath my property at 81 Denison St, Rozelle which is otherwise only proposed at tunnel entry and exit points. The EIS also states that a portion of the Rozelle Rail Yards will be maintained as a WHT construction site after this Project so tunnelling beneath our properties will continue beyond this Project.

The EIS states that the above tunnels will result in the following impacts to my neighbourhood:

- Higher ground borne noise than recommended night time levels of 35dB for periods of up to 19 days (EIS pg 10-128 and 10-129) and “Due to the number of tunnels being constructed in this area (consecutive construction works) the duration of impacts may extend at these locations”. This is highly likely to impact our sleep, mental health and comfort and is absolutely unacceptable.
- Ground movement above the preferred criteria of 20mm and up to 35mm for some properties (EIS pg 12-39, 12-44). This is highly likely to cause significant, irreversible and avoidable structural damage to our properties.

The EIS notes that steps can be taken to mitigate the above impacts but these steps provide me with no comfort whatsoever given they could be avoided completely by delaying the tunnels until the WHT is approved in its entirety (which may never happen), particularly given they are not even connecting to the M4-M5 link that is the point of this Project, or by increasing their depth to a depth of 20-35m like all other tunnels throughout Rozelle to meet **your own criteria of <20mm settlement and <35dB noise**. If the tunnels must be shallow, consideration must be given to moving them beneath Easton Park to avoid property damage. I am also insulted that responses to my concern from the Project community engagement team have confirmed the tunnels are at 10m below my property but provided no reason for them being 10m below which was my question. They have only provided assurances that there will be an independent panel to assess damage and it will be fixed. This will not account for the considerable anxiety, financial stress and inconvenience to my family which will not be compensated for.

The EIS also provides no discussion of what residents above these 10m shallow tunnels will suffer in ongoing noise and vibration and I find it hard to believe that there will be no impact. Nor does it mention the depth or ongoing operational impact of exhaust ventilation tunnels under our properties and whether the settlement analysis above included these tunnels. I was fortunate to become aware of their existence given diagrams of these ventilation tunnels were hidden in an unrelated section of the EIS. These issues must be addressed and mitigated from the perspective of residents as they are likely to have a large impact on the value of my property which will not be compensated for. I am told by Cindy Kennedy of McGrath that residents in Haberfield with shallow tunnels underneath them have suffered a 10% decline in the value of their houses since the M4 Project. That is a loss of \$250-300k on our house alone.

The EIS also fails to address the fact that the main stormwater drainage pipe for our neighbourhood is underneath Denison St and Easton Park and could be damaged by shallow tunnelling. Damage to this pipe could cause catastrophic damage to property in times of heavy rainfall with our property and our neighbours properties identified as flood lots by the Inner West Council. Residents would be forced to take legal action to remedy these losses.

**I am therefore outraged by the current Rozelle Interchange design and demand that:**

- **No tunnelling of the WHT connections proceed in Rozelle until that project is approved in its entirety, particularly the Western Harbour Tunnel connections to the City West link which are entirely unnecessary to include in this Project.**
- **Any shallow (<20m) WHT connections be moved entirely beneath Easton Park where property damage will not be an issue.**
- **The ongoing operational noise impact of exhaust ventilation tunnels, their substations and shallow 10m tunnels underneath my property at 81 Denison St and the surrounding properties be properly assessed and mitigated.**
- **Proper consideration be given to the potential damage that shallow tunnelling in this area may cause to the main stormwater pipe under Denison St and Easton Park.**
- **The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in my neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria. There are three storey buildings and masonry buildings in this neighbourhood which will suffer damage even at 20mm, including my own.**
- **Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in my neighbourhood.**

## **2. Proposed Rozelle Rail Yards green space must be committed to and funded**

I have major concerns about this Project impacting my property and family for years. I and many neighbours I have spoken to are willing to accept some of these impacts given the Project design includes conversion of the Rozelle Rail Yards into community green space upon

completion. I am extremely concerned that this green space will be neither committed to nor funded and residents will not receive the carrot at the end of the construction hell that we were promised.

This green space must be committed to and fully funded with the Inner West Council responsible for its design based on community feedback. The Project contractors must also be responsible for handing over the site to the Inner West Council in a non-contaminated state that is safe for surrounding communities to enjoy for many years to come.

### **3. Wetlands and above ground drainage proposed in the Rozelle Rail Yards must be reconsidered due to mosquitoes, flood risk and children's safety**

The current design of the Rozelle Rail Yards operational facilities includes a wetland and considerable amounts of surface drainage (EIS pg 5-92). I am concerned that this design will:

1. Alter the flood risk of the surrounding areas, which are recognised flood lots in the Inner West Council's Flood Plan, and this impact must be properly assessed.
2. Result in stagnant water and a corresponding increase the mosquito population in the area and the risk of mosquito borne diseases.
3. Cause potential water safety issues due to the proximity of a wetland near a children's playground and oval.
4. Result in contaminated water given the EIS states that the wetland is to treat and "polish phosphorus and nitrogen" (EIS Pg 5-98) from the exhaust fumes and the soil beneath it is already contaminated.
5. Be unsightly when this drainage could be moved underground.

This design should be reconsidered to mitigate the above issues.

### **4. Construction impacts on our Rozelle neighbourhood must be properly addressed, including dust, contaminants, noise, traffic and public transport access**

I have considerable concern that the removal of Swadlins and neighbouring buildings across from Easton Park will increase the strength of winds which blow across Easton Park into our properties facing the park on Denison St. These winds will now bring dust and noise and may not have been accounted for in studies on noise and pollutants to residents. I am particularly concerned about dust and its impact on the respiratory health of my family. Residents must be informed of steps that will be taken to reduce dust and a complaints hotline provided to allow residents to report unacceptable dust such that it can be immediately remediated.

I understand the Rozelle Rail Yards are contaminated with asbestos and am very concerned the above noted winds will bring asbestos with them during remediation and construction. A full plan of how these Rail Yards will be remediated and the contaminants removed must be presented to local residents before this remediation begins. I understand from mail drops that this

remediation is being handled separately and imminently (ie. before the Project approval) which is very concerning.

The EIS indicates the Rozelle Rail Yards will be the workplace for up to 100-350 cars coming and going every day. These vehicle movements will place significant pressure on Lilyfield Rd, Gordon St and intersections where vehicles turn off Lilyfield Rd to access the City West Link. These intersections are already congested during peak hours and the EIS fails to provide a plan as to how this increase in traffic will impact local residents trying to use Lilyfield Rd for local school / child care drop offs and to access the City West Link.

The EIS states that the Victoria Rd pedestrian bridge will be closed and the nearby bus stops closed / moved for significant periods of time. These are critical access points for residents in this area to cycle to / from work in the CBD or catch buses to / from work in the CBD and must not be closed. Alternative plans must be assessed to avoid this.

I note that the EIS states there will be no operational noise impact after construction for my address. I expect this to be proven post construction or mitigated.

I also note that the EIS states there will be no heavy haulage on Lilyfield Rd or Denison St. This must be committed to.

#### **5. Ventilation / Exhaust Stacks in Rozelle Rail Yards must be reduced to two stacks in keeping with surrounding landscape and be filtered**

The proposed 35m high exhaust stacks (EIS pg 5-36) are unsightly and their impact to resident's views must be minimised. Firstly, there should only be two stacks for this project and the exhaust stack for the WHT should be moved elsewhere such that residents here do not suffer the pollution from the M4-M5 link and the WHT. Secondly, they should be in keeping with surrounding landscape and not look gleaming stainless steel like a nuclear power plant as shown in the artist impression in the EIS (EIS Figure 13-26). Their size and height should also be reduced.

Exhaust stacks in the Rozelle Rail Yards must be filtered. Any increase to pollution, even is minimal to what is already expected on surface roads, is not acceptable. Even if you are relying on the modelling, consideration must be given to the fact that the pollution modelling is linked to the traffic modelling which I believe is flawed so the stacks must be filtered until the Project can prove to surrounding residents that the modelling of minimal pollution impact was indeed correct. I am not willing to take the gamble with my family's health during this time.

#### **6. Ventilation / Exhaust Stacks near Rozelle Primary School must be Filtered**

Exhaust stacks near Rozelle Primary School should be moved to an alternative site or at a minimum, filtered. Any increase to pollution, even is minimal to what is already expected on

surface roads, is not acceptable. Even if you are relying on the modelling, consideration must be given to the fact that the pollution modelling is linked to the traffic modelling which I believe is flawed so the stacks must be filtered until the Project can prove to surrounding residents that the modelling of minimal pollution impact was indeed correct. I am not willing to take the gamble with my family's health during this time.

#### **7. The Darley Road construction site must be reassessed and moved elsewhere**

Tunnelling from a site next to a known black spot intersection and one tied up in so much corruption is unacceptable. The EIS also states that dust, noise and other construction impacts are also likely to affect children at the nearby Billy Kids Early Learning centre. My son attends Billy Kids and I completely object to the use of this site as the main M4-M5 Link tunnelling site.

Kind Regards,  
Rachael Davern  
81 Denison St  
Rozelle NSW 2039

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 04:10:38 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Rachael Davern of Mrs (comments)  
**Attachments:** 228121\_Petition\_2017Oct16\_1503.pdf, 228121\_Westconnex EIS Petition  
Sumbission\_2017Oct16\_1503.pdf

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfRachael Davern  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 3:04:21 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Rachael Davern of Mrs (comments)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Rachael Davern  
Organisation: Mrs (2039)  
Email: rach.davern@gmail.com

Address:  
81 Denison St

Rozelle, NSW  
2039

Content:  
Please see attached a letter submission and a second attachment containing 128 signatures pas part of a petition referred to in the letter. We object to shallow tunnelling in the Rozelle Neighbourhood.

IP Address: 124-171-21-118.dyn.iinet.net.au - 124.171.21.118  
Submission: Online Submission from Rachael Davern of Mrs (comments)  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228121](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228121)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

• **Protein-DNA Interaction**: **Transcription Factor** binds to **Regulatory Region** of DNA.

**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**





In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

**We are outraged and demand that:**

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.









Name	Address	Signature
Josh Stafford	3/1 Albert Street Rozelle	
Gabrielle Stafford	3/1 Albert Street Rozelle	
Chris Roberts	1/1 ALBERT ST "	
Elvardo Folioche	4/1 ALBERT ST "	
Polly Pullin	4/1 Albert St Rozelle	
Roxanne Costello	2 Alice st Rozelle	
Will Shockey	4 Brockley St	
Kevin Tary	83 Denison St Rozelle	
Ted Roberson	48 hony Street	
Kate Greene	4 Brockley St	

**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**  
**In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS**  
**October 2017**

**We are outraged and demand that:**

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
Claire Dunne	103/29 Margaret St., Rozelle 2039	
Liam Muller	5 Rayner St Lilyfield 2009	
Laura Arnott	106 Hubert St, Lilyfield	
MELANIE ELEK-HARRICK	210 YOUNG ST, ANNANDALE 2038	
JOHN ARNOTT	106 HUBERT ST, LILYFIELD	
DARIN COVENY	75 DENISON ST, ROZELLE	
KRISTI COVENY	75 DENISON ST ROZELLE	
TARIQ KHAN	11A EAST ST ROZELLE	
JASON LE	87 DENISON ST ROZELLE	
CASSIE MULLER	5 RAYNER ST LILYFIELD 2009	
MAIRA STEWART	304 NORTON ST LEICHHARDT	
MURRAY STEWART	304 Norton St. LEICHHARDT	






**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
ADRIAN LEPPARD	99 DENISON ST. ROZELLE	
Adrian Leppard	99 DENISON ST ROZELLE	
Karen Jackson	103 Denison St Rozelle	
JANNI KRONEMER	261 BALMAIN RD LILYFIELD	
Poppy Jackson	" " "	
ROBERT RUD	103 DENISON ST. ROZELLE	
JANINE HOFFMAN	2A Alice St, Rozelle NSW 2039	
Greg Hoffman	2A Alice St. Rozelle, NSW 2039	
Shirley Hartin	56 Glover street, Lilyfield	
Audrea Sorensen	26 PROSPER STREET ROZELLE	
Lidiamorillo	151 Lilyfield road Lilyfield	
MATTHEW FRY	6 Spring Stk Birchgrave	
DAVID KENT	7 EASTON ST ROZELLE	
RICHARD TOWNSLEY	4 EASTON ST ROZELLE	
Rick Smyth-King	2 Easton St Rozelle	




**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

**We are outraged and demand that:**

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
Colleen Andreacchio	3 Easton St, Rozelle	
Paul Andreacchio	3 EASTON ST ROZELLE	
Seb Blades	81a Denison STREET	
Toni Smith	83 Denison St, Rozelle	
KEVIN TORY	83 DENISON ST ROZELLE	
MIC CONWAY	26 GANNON ave ULYFIEU	
Gisela Weber	1 Cheltenham ST Rozelle	
Michael Williams	18 Stewart St. Balmain	
mick Pajovic	10 Burt ST Rozelle	
GUY MCGUINN	5/3 Pine Tree Rozelle	
Adam Myers	4/6 Joseph St, Rozelle	
Amanda Campbell	89 Denison St Rozelle	
A. Campbell	89 Denison St. Rozelle	
Kerry Flynn	91 Denison St Rozelle	
Elizabeth Johnstone	97 Denison St Rozelle	
Jake Johnstone	97 Denison st Rozelle	












**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
Simon Jeffery	10 ALFRED ST. ROZELLE	
ANNA BELWYN C	66 RYANST LILYFIELD	
J. Lawrence	42 O'NEILL ST LILYFIELD	
A Platford.	62 CECILY ST LILYFIELD	
P. Brattan	11 DENISON ST, ROZELLE	
S STEINER	45 COOK ST ROZELLE	
S Hando	49 ALFRED ST, ROZELLE	
Annie Starr	62 Cecily St, Lilyfield	
Jess Rossie	27 Denison St Rozelle 2031	
Hesley Haug	2 Percy St Rozelle	
G. BRISLEY	5-2-12 Emily st Rozelle	
R. GRANGER	58 ALFRED ST ROZELLE	
S. Kenny	2/35A FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
S. Frankham	24A Seaview St, Summerhill	
S Lloyd	HOCELYS LILYFIELD	





**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
PG M ATTENOR	48A Denison St Rozelle	
VIKI JONES	81 Ryan St Lilyfield	
TJ O'LEARY	Charlton 47-57 Highfield Parade	
GRAHAM HANLEY	69 Lilyfield Rd Rozelle	
MARK FAYLE	32 Foucart St, Rozelle	
ROBERT WAU	43 ALFRED ST ROZELLE	
YI YAU	Aylor St Rozelle	
VICKI SOOSOURAS	20 Ryan St, Lilyfield	
Andrea Nichols	Unit 2/12 Emily St Rozelle	
DONNA MOSFORD	90 FOUCART ST, ROZELLE	
SARAH HUCKBY	68 FOUCART ST, ROZELLE	
LIZ BRIDWE	530 DARLING ST ROZELLE	
YOKO PEMBROKE	84B FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
MIRIAM KROHN	1/35B FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
TRACY LINNE	19 Ferry St Rozelle	

Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20m EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature	Ph N°.
DOUGLAS MUR	FOUCART ST ROZELLE	Douglas Murs	
Sally Baird	Burt St Rozelle	Sally Baird	
Lizze Watson	Denison St Rozelle	Lizze Watson	
Sue-Ellen King	Denison st. Rozelle	Sue-Ellen King	
Leanne Roberts	48 HUNTER STREET	Leanne Roberts	
James Pronost	3/2 BURT ST ROZELLE	James Pronost	
Jennifer Pringle	19 Ryan St Lilyfield	Jennifer Pringle	
Rebecca Grazzi	61 Denison St, Rozelle	Rebecca Grazzi	
Tekka Smith	CHELTENHAM ST LILYFIELD	Tekka Smith	
Georgie Watts	ALBERTO ST LILYFIELD	Georgie Watts	
D Ballantyne	2 CHELTENHAM ST ROZELLE	D Ballantyne	
A. SCARPINATO	18/31 ALFRED ST ROZELLE	A. Scarpinato	
N. BURRICH	78 Lilyfield Rd Rozelle	N. Burrich	
P WARNINK	16 FOUCART STREET	P. Warnink	
R. Budge	10 COOK ST ROZELLE	R. Budge	

**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
Rachael Daven	81 Denison St, Rozelle	RJ Daven
Stephen Daven	81 Denison St, Rozelle	SD
Troy Brewster	73 Denison St Rozelle	TB
Victoria Welsh	10 Reynolds St Rozelle	Welsh
Sam Jones	5/33-35 Alfred St Rozelle	SJ
Ilsa Lorenz	16 Brux St, Rozelle	Ilsa Lorenz
Kristen Long	9/5 ALFRED ST ROZELLE	KL
Clair Daley	3 Percy St, Rozelle	CD
Elizabeth Vlahos	79 Denison St Rozelle	Elizabeth Vlahos
BRENDAN SMITH	71 DENISON ST ROZELLE	Brendan Smith
KENNY JOSEPH	8 CHELTENHAM ST ROZELLE	KJ
Stuart Smith	10 Cheltenham St Rozelle	Stuart Smith
Krislen Dunphy	10 Cheltenham St Rozelle	Krislen Dunphy
DIANA THOMAS	12 Cheltenham St Rozelle	Diana Thomas
Marianne Hartley	1 Eastow St, Rozelle	Marianne Hartley










Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
K Jacobson	103 Denison St Rozelle	
Karen Coleman	3 CECILY STREET, LILYFIELD	
Deren Porter	56 Busq St, Rozelle	
Terry King	69 Denison St Rozelle	
Pamela Joy Fuge	b. Elizabeth St Rozelle	
Seb Blades	61A DENISON STREET	
Margot Saurle	65 Foucart St Rozelle	
Mossie Hartnett	83 Cecily st. Lilyfield	
DANIEL LANCE	5 MAIN ST LIVFELD	
JUDY SMYTH KING	2 EASTON ST ROZELLE	
S. OSBORNE	35 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
N. OSBORNE	35 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
J VON SYNGHE	33 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
Julie Mills	31 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
KATE REILLY	27 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	

16th October 2017

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

**RE: Application number SSI 16-7485, Westconnex M4-M5 Link, EIS Submission**

To Whom It May Concern,

I write on behalf of my neighbours living in the area roughly bounded by Albert St, Foucart St, Cheltenham St and Denison St, Rozelle (the "Neighbourhood"). **This submission includes the attached petition with 128 signatures of people who either live in this Neighbourhood or visit Easton Park. It should be treated as submissions from 128 individuals, not just one submission.** I request that the names and addresses of the individuals not be published.

I note that 120+ signatures were gathered from only a few days of door knocking this Neighbourhood and approaching people in Easton Park so it may not seem like a large number for a petition, but it is significant when you consider that 93% of the addresses in the above Neighbourhood where someone was home are represented. Only three residents declined, two of which were conflicted by their occupations.

**Firstly, we object to the lack of proper community consultation as part of the Westconnex M4-M5 Link (the "Project") Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS").** Consultation is not a few meetings in a town hall and the provision of glossy brochures which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a 'plan'. Nor is it bombarding the public with thousands of pages in an EIS which many of them cannot even understand where the details of shallow tunnels, ground settlement and night time noise are almost impossible to decipher. Nearly all of my neighbours were completely unaware of the shallow tunnels proposed beneath their properties or their impact until they heard about them through my petition. As I door knocked I was met with faces of despair, anger, shock, frustration, confusion and helplessness with many of them asking numerous questions they were unable to find answers to in the EIS. This is completely unfair and unacceptable.

Despite the above, this Neighbourhood is deeply concerned by findings outlined in the EIS. In particular, the current Project design results in multiple tunnels beneath our Neighbourhood for the Iron Cove Link, Western Harbour Tunnel ("WHT") links and for exhaust ventilation tunnels. The Western Harbour Tunnel connections are particularly concerning given they are proposed to be at an unnecessarily shallow depth of less than 10m at the Burt St / Denison St corner of

Easton Park (EIS pg 6-25) which is otherwise only proposed at tunnel entry and exit points. They are also for a project which is years away from approval and may never proceed.

The EIS states that the above tunnels will result in the following impacts to our Neighbourhood:

- Higher ground borne noise than recommended night time levels of 35dB for periods of up to 19 days (EIS pg 10-128 and 10-129) and "Due to the number of tunnels being constructed in this area (consecutive construction works) the duration of impacts may extend at these locations". This is highly likely to impact our sleep, mental health and comfort on multiple occasions and is absolutely unacceptable in a neighbourhood with so many young families and children.
- Ground movement above the preferred criteria of 20mm and up to 35mm for some properties (EIS pg 12-39, 12-44). This is highly likely to cause significant, irreversible and avoidable structural damage to our properties.

The EIS notes that steps can be taken to mitigate the above impacts but these steps provide us with no comfort whatsoever given there is currently no commitment to these measures. We also believe they could be avoided completely by delaying the tunnels until the WHT is approved in its entirety (which may never happen) or by increasing these tunnel depths to 20-35m like all other tunnels throughout Rozelle to **meet your own criteria of <20mm settlement and <35dB noise.**

We are aware that an independent panel will be established to assess properties before and after tunneling and that the Project will be liable for fixing property damage. We would expect nothing less. These measures provide us with little comfort given the stories we are hearing from residents above the M4 tunnels in Haberfield and the lack of accountability of the construction contractor for damage caused to their properties. We also note that this does not account for the considerable anxiety, financial stress and inconvenience to our families to repair damage which will not be compensated for.

The EIS also provides no information on what residents above these 10m shallow tunnels will suffer in ongoing noise and vibration and we find it hard to believe that there will be no impact. Nor does it mention the depth or ongoing operational impact of exhaust ventilation tunnels under our properties, and whether these tunnels were included in the above settlement analysis. The existence of these tunnels were hidden in an unrelated section of the EIS. These issues must be addressed and mitigated from the perspective of residents as they are likely to have a large impact on the value of our properties which will not be compensated for. I am told by Cindy Kennedy of McGrath that residents in Haberfield with shallow tunnels underneath them have suffered a ~10% decline in the value of their houses due to the M4 Project. Those types of losses would soon start to justify a legal class action from residents in this Neighbourhood.

The EIS also fails to address the fact that the main stormwater drainage pipes for our Neighbourhood flow beneath our properties and beneath Easton Park. These pipes could be accidentally damaged by shallow tunnelling, resulting in unintended catastrophic flood damage

given many properties in this Neighbourhood are identified as flood lots by the Inner West Council. Residents would be forced to take legal action to remedy these losses.

**Put simply, the current design is unjust. We are outraged and demand that:**

- **No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.**
- **The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.**
- **Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.**

Our voices must be heard as part of this EIS process.

Kind Regards,  
Rachael Davern  
81 Denison St  
Rozelle, NSW, 2039

Note: Petition pages are attached separately

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 04:12:24 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Rachael Davern of Mrs (comments)  
**Attachments:** 228123\_Petition\_2017Oct16\_1506.pdf, 228123\_Westconnex EIS Petition  
Sumbission\_2017Oct16\_1506.pdf

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfRachael Davern  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 3:07:12 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Rachael Davern of Mrs (comments)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Rachael Davern  
Organisation: Mrs (2039)  
Email: rach.davern@gmail.com

Address:  
81 Denison St

Rozelle, NSW  
2039

Content:  
I object to the design of the Rozelle Interchange tunnels and so does my neighbourhood- see attached petition with 128 signatures.

IP Address: 124-171-21-118.dyn.iinet.net.au - 124.171.21.118  
Submission: Online Submission from Rachael Davern of Mrs (comments)  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228123](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228123)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

• **Protein-DNA Interaction**: **Transcription Factor** binds to **Regulatory Sequence** of DNA.

**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**






In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

**We are outraged and demand that:**

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.








Name	Address	Signature
Josh Stafford	3/1 Albert Street Rozelle	
Gabrielle Stafford	3/1 Albert Street Rozelle	
Chris Roberts	1/1 ALBERT ST "	
Elvardo Folioche	4/1 ALBERT ST "	
Polly Pullin	4/1 Albert St Rozelle	
Roxanne Costello	2 Alice st Rozelle	
Will Shockey	4 Brockley St	
Kevin Tary	83 Denison St Rozelle	
Ted Roberson	48 hony Street	
Kate Greene	4 Brockley St	

**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**  
**In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS**  
**October 2017**

**We are outraged and demand that:**

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
Claire Dunne	103/29 Margaret St., Rozelle 2039	
Liam Muller	5 Rayner St Lilyfield 2009	
Laura Arnott	106 Hubert St, Lilyfield	
MELANIE ELEK-HARRICK	210 YOUNG ST, ANNANDALE 2038	
JOHN ARNOTT	106 HUBERT ST, LILYFIELD	
DARIN COVENY	75 DENISON ST, ROZELLE	
KRISTI COVENY	75 DENISON ST ROZELLE	
TARIQ KHAN	11A EAST ST ROZELLE	
JASON LE	87 DENISON ST ROZELLE	
CASSIE MULLER	5 RAYNER ST LILYFIELD 2009	
MAIRA STEWART	304 NORTON ST LEICHHARDT	
MURRAY STEWART	304 Norton St. LEICHHARDT	






**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
ADRIAN LEPPARD	99 DENISON ST. ROZELLE	
Adrian Leppard	99 DENISON ST ROZELLE	
Karen Jackson	103 Denison St Rozelle	
JANNI KRONEMER	261 BALMAIN RD LILYFIELD	
Poppy Jackson	" " "	
ROBERT RUD	103 DENISON ST. ROZELLE	
JANINE HOFFMAN	2A Alice St, Rozelle NSW 2039	
Greg Hoffman	2A Alice St. Rozelle, NSW 2039	
Shirley Hartin	56 Glover street, Lilyfield	
Audrea Sorensen	26 PROSPER STREET ROZELLE	
Lidiamorillo	151 Lilyfield road Lilyfield	
MATTHEW FRY	6 Spring Stk Birchgrave	
DAVID KENT	7 EASTON ST ROZELLE	
RICHARD TOWNSLEY	4 EASTON ST ROZELLE	
Rick Smyth-King	2 Easton St Rozelle	




**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

**We are outraged and demand that:**

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
Colleen Andreacchio	3 Easton St, Rozelle	
Paul Andreacchio	3 EASTON ST ROZELLE	
Seb Blades	81a Denison STREET	
Toni Smith	83 Denison St, Rozelle	
KEVIN TORY	83 DENISON ST ROZELLE	
MIC CONWAY	26 GANNON ave ULYFIEU	
Gisela Weber	1 Cheltenham ST Rozelle	
Michael Williams	18 Stewart St. Balmain	
mick Pajovic	10 Burt ST Rozelle	
GUY MCGUINN	5/3 Pine Tree Rozelle	
Adam Myers	4/6 Joseph St, Rozelle	
Amanda Campbell	89 Denison St Rozelle	
A. Campbell	89 Denison St. Rozelle	
Kerry Flynn	91 Denison St Rozelle	
Elizabeth Johnstone	97 Denison St Rozelle	
Jake Johnstone	97 Denison st Rozelle	











**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
Simon Jeffery	10 ALFRED ST. ROZELLE	
ANNA BELWYN C	66 RYANST LILYFIELD	
J. Lawrence	42 O'NEILL ST LILYFIELD	
A Platford.	62 CECILY ST LILYFIELD	
P. Brattan	11 DENISON ST, ROZELLE	
S STEINER	45 COOK ST ROZELLE	
S Hando	49 ALFRED ST, ROZELLE	
Annie Starr	62 Cecily St, Lilyfield	
Jess Rossie	27 Denison St Rozelle 2031	
Hesley Haug	2 Percy St Rozelle	
G. BRISLEY	5-2-12 Emily st Rozelle	
R. GRANGER	58 ALFRED ST ROZELLE	
S. Kenny	2/35A FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
S. Frankham	24A Seaview St, Summerhill	
S Lloyd	HOCELYS LILYFIELD	




**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
PG M ATTENOR	48A Denison St Rozelle	
VIKI JONES	81 Ryan St Lilyfield	
TJ O'LEARY	Chatswood 47-57 Highfield Parade	
GRAHAM HANLEY	69 Lilyfield Rd Rozelle	
MARK FAYLE	32 Foucart St, Rozelle	
ROBERT WAU	43 ALFRED ST ROZELLE	
YI YAU	Aylor St Rozelle	
VICKI SOOSOURAS	20 Ryan St, Lilyfield	
Andrea Nichols	Unit 2/12 Emily st Rozelle	
DONNA MOSFORD	90 FOUCART ST, ROZELLE	
SARAH HUCKBY	68 FOUCART ST, ROZELLE	
LIZ BRIDWE	530 DARLING ST ROZELLE	
YOKO PEMBROKE	84B FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
MIRIAM KROHN	1/35B FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
TRACY LINES	19 Ferry St Rozelle	

Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20m EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature	Ph N°.
DOUGLAS MUR	FOUCART ST ROZELLE	Douglas Murs	
Sally Baird	Burt St Rozelle	Sally Baird	
Lizze Watson	Denison St Rozelle	Lizze Watson	
Sue-Ellen King	Denison st. Rozelle	Sue-Ellen King	
Leanne Roberts	48 HUNTER STREET	Leanne Roberts	
James Pronost	3/2 BURT ST ROZELLE	James Pronost	
Jennifer Pringle	19 Ryan St Lilyfield	Jennifer Pringle	
Rebecca Grazzi	61 Denison St, Rozelle	Rebecca Grazzi	
Tekka Smith	CHELTENHAM ST LILYFIELD	Tekka Smith	
Georgie Watts	ALBERTO ST LILYFIELD	Georgie Watts	
D Ballantyne	2 CHELTENHAM ST ROZELLE	D Ballantyne	
A. SCARPINATO	18/31 ALFRED ST ROZELLE	A. Scarpinato	
N. BURRICH	78 Lilyfield Rd Rozelle	N. Burrich	
P WARNINK	16 FOUCART STREET	P. Warnink	
R. Budge	10 COOK ST ROZELLE	R. Budge	

**Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections**

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
Rachael Daven	81 Denison St, Rozelle	RJ Daven
Stephen Daven	81 Denison St, Rozelle	SD
Troy Brewster	73 Denison St Rozelle	TB
Victoria Welsh	10 Reynolds St Rozelle	Welsh
Sam Jones	5/33-35 Alfred St Rozelle	SJ
Ilsa Lorenz	16 Brux St, Rozelle	
Kristen Long	9/5 ALFRED ST ROZELLE	KL
Clair Daley	3 Percy St, Rozelle	CD
Elizabeth Vlahos	79 Denison St Rozelle	Elizabeth Vlahos
BRENDAN SMITH	71 DENISON ST ROZELLE	Brendan Smith
KENNY JOSEPH	8 CHELTENHAM ST ROZELLE	KJ
Stuart Smith	10 Cheltenham St Rozelle	Stuart Smith
Krislen Dunay	10 Cheltenham St Rozelle	Krislen Dunay
DIANA THOMAS	12 Cheltenham St Rozelle	Diana Thomas
Marianne Hartley	1 Eastow St, Rozelle	Marianne Hartley









Petition to Stop the Unnecessary Western Harbour Tunnel Connections

In response to the Westconnex M4-M5 Link EIS

October 2017

We are outraged and demand that:

- No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.
- The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.
- Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.

Name	Address	Signature
K Jacobson	103 Denison St Rozelle	
Karen Coleman	3 CECILY STREET, LILYFIELD	
Deeven Porter	56 Busq St, Rozelle	
Terry King	69 Denison St Rozelle	
Pamela Joy Fuge	b. Elizabeth St Rozelle	
Seb Blades	61A DENISON STREET	
Margot Saurle	65 Foucart St Rozelle	
Mossie Hartnett	83 Cecily st. Lilyfield	
DANIEL LANCE	5 MAIN ST LIVFELD	
JUDY SMYTH KING	2 EASTON ST ROZELLE	
S. OSBORNE	35 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
N. OSBORNE	35 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
J VON SYNGHE	33 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
Julie Mills	31 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	
KATE REILLY	27 FOUCART ST ROZELLE	

16th October 2017

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

**RE: Application number SSI 16-7485, Westconnex M4-M5 Link, EIS Submission**

To Whom It May Concern,

I write on behalf of my neighbours living in the area roughly bounded by Albert St, Foucart St, Cheltenham St and Denison St, Rozelle (the "Neighbourhood"). **This submission includes the attached petition with 128 signatures of people who either live in this Neighbourhood or visit Easton Park. It should be treated as submissions from 128 individuals, not just one submission.** I request that the names and addresses of the individuals not be published.

I note that 120+ signatures were gathered from only a few days of door knocking this Neighbourhood and approaching people in Easton Park so it may not seem like a large number for a petition, but it is significant when you consider that 93% of the addresses in the above Neighbourhood where someone was home are represented. Only three residents declined, two of which were conflicted by their occupations.

**Firstly, we object to the lack of proper community consultation as part of the Westconnex M4-M5 Link (the "Project") Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS").** Consultation is not a few meetings in a town hall and the provision of glossy brochures which minimise the negative aspects of a project and state that every impact will be managed by a 'plan'. Nor is it bombarding the public with thousands of pages in an EIS which many of them cannot even understand where the details of shallow tunnels, ground settlement and night time noise are almost impossible to decipher. Nearly all of my neighbours were completely unaware of the shallow tunnels proposed beneath their properties or their impact until they heard about them through my petition. As I door knocked I was met with faces of despair, anger, shock, frustration, confusion and helplessness with many of them asking numerous questions they were unable to find answers to in the EIS. This is completely unfair and unacceptable.

Despite the above, this Neighbourhood is deeply concerned by findings outlined in the EIS. In particular, the current Project design results in multiple tunnels beneath our Neighbourhood for the Iron Cove Link, Western Harbour Tunnel ("WHT") links and for exhaust ventilation tunnels. The Western Harbour Tunnel connections are particularly concerning given they are proposed to be at an unnecessarily shallow depth of less than 10m at the Burt St / Denison St corner of

Easton Park (EIS pg 6-25) which is otherwise only proposed at tunnel entry and exit points. They are also for a project which is years away from approval and may never proceed.

The EIS states that the above tunnels will result in the following impacts to our Neighbourhood:

- Higher ground borne noise than recommended night time levels of 35dB for periods of up to 19 days (EIS pg 10-128 and 10-129) and "Due to the number of tunnels being constructed in this area (consecutive construction works) the duration of impacts may extend at these locations". This is highly likely to impact our sleep, mental health and comfort on multiple occasions and is absolutely unacceptable in a neighbourhood with so many young families and children.
- Ground movement above the preferred criteria of 20mm and up to 35mm for some properties (EIS pg 12-39, 12-44). This is highly likely to cause significant, irreversible and avoidable structural damage to our properties.

The EIS notes that steps can be taken to mitigate the above impacts but these steps provide us with no comfort whatsoever given there is currently no commitment to these measures. We also believe they could be avoided completely by delaying the tunnels until the WHT is approved in its entirety (which may never happen) or by increasing these tunnel depths to 20-35m like all other tunnels throughout Rozelle to **meet your own criteria of <20mm settlement and <35dB noise.**

We are aware that an independent panel will be established to assess properties before and after tunneling and that the Project will be liable for fixing property damage. We would expect nothing less. These measures provide us with little comfort given the stories we are hearing from residents above the M4 tunnels in Haberfield and the lack of accountability of the construction contractor for damage caused to their properties. We also note that this does not account for the considerable anxiety, financial stress and inconvenience to our families to repair damage which will not be compensated for.

The EIS also provides no information on what residents above these 10m shallow tunnels will suffer in ongoing noise and vibration and we find it hard to believe that there will be no impact. Nor does it mention the depth or ongoing operational impact of exhaust ventilation tunnels under our properties, and whether these tunnels were included in the above settlement analysis. The existence of these tunnels were hidden in an unrelated section of the EIS. These issues must be addressed and mitigated from the perspective of residents as they are likely to have a large impact on the value of our properties which will not be compensated for. I am told by Cindy Kennedy of McGrath that residents in Haberfield with shallow tunnels underneath them have suffered a ~10% decline in the value of their houses due to the M4 Project. Those types of losses would soon start to justify a legal class action from residents in this Neighbourhood.

The EIS also fails to address the fact that the main stormwater drainage pipes for our Neighbourhood flow beneath our properties and beneath Easton Park. These pipes could be accidentally damaged by shallow tunnelling, resulting in unintended catastrophic flood damage

given many properties in this Neighbourhood are identified as flood lots by the Inner West Council. Residents would be forced to take legal action to remedy these losses.

**Put simply, the current design is unjust. We are outraged and demand that:**

- **No tunnelling of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections proceed in our Neighbourhood until that project is approved in its entirety.**
- **The depth of the Western Harbour Tunnel connections be increased to at a minimum, reduce ground movement settlement in this Neighbourhood to below the 20mm EIS criteria.**
- **Conditions of approval of the Project include clear mitigation strategies to ensure ground borne noise does not exceed the recommended night time NML of 35dB for extended periods on repeat occasions in our Neighbourhood.**

Our voices must be heard as part of this EIS process.

Kind Regards,  
Rachael Davern  
81 Denison St  
Rozelle, NSW, 2039

Note: Petition pages are attached separately

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 07:47:24 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Jack Kelly (object)

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfJack Kelly  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 6:45:05 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Jack Kelly (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Jack Kelly  
Email: jackkelly\_balmain@hotmail.com

Address:  
133 Lyons Road

Drummoyne, NSW  
2047

Content:  
I oppose the Rozelle interchange. Please refuse it

IP Address: - 101.191.40.247  
Submission: Online Submission from Jack Kelly (object)  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228269](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228269)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 09:19:47 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Kimberley Schoonens (object)

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfKimberley Schoonens  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 8:19:03 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Kimberley Schoonens (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Kimberley Schoonens  
Email: kachurch@gmail.com

Address:  
21 Mackenzie Street

Rozelle, NSW  
2039

Content:

Dear Sir / Madam,

I understand that the WestConnex M4-M5 Link will be proceeding and the benefits the infrastructure will have on the broader State of NSW. However, given the location of my family's home and our travel requirements it will be of no benefit to my family or many other residents in Rozelle and the Inner West. Given this infrastructure is being forced upon local residents for the benefit of others, it would only seem appropriate that the State seek to reduce its impact on local families. Given my family lives in Rozelle and my children will in future years be attending Rozelle Primary School, I ask that the ventilation stacks be fitted filtration systems. Such systems exist and are surely worth the investment to protect the health of my family and other local residents.

Kind regards  
Kimberley Schoonens

IP Address: d49-191-1-38.mas1.nsw.optusnet.com.au - 49.191.1.38  
Submission: Online Submission from Kimberley Schoonens (object)  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228297](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228297)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 09:59:27 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Owen Fitzgerald (object)

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfOwen Fitzgerald  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 8:56:03 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Owen Fitzgerald (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Owen Fitzgerald  
Email: ofitzgerald@live.com.au

Address:  
106 Hayberry Street

Crows Nest, NSW  
2065

Content:

I strongly object to the M4M5 Link. Modern cities throughout the world are not building inner city freeways - it is recognised that these do not fix congestion or journey time. Any relief is temporary and traffic returns to its congested state as more people choose to drive. Many cities are removing freeways or roads to create more livable cities.

The M4M5 includes the start of the tunnels for the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link (WHT & BL). This project should not be started via an EIS for another project. Including these tunnels is advancing the project by stealth and the WHT & BL has had no environmental assessment and has not been designed yet. There has been no meaningful community involvement in the WHT & BL. tunnels

One of the objectives of the M4-M5 is to facilitate the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link - this is unacceptable when it is still in the developmental phase.

This EIS identifies the Western Harbour Tunnel as mitigation for the impacts of the M4-M5 Link. This creates the need for the unapproved WHT &BL. The M4-M5 Link will overload the Anzac Bridge with traffic- this then leads to the another means of moving traffic.

The M4-M5 Link will encourage additional traffic on to the road network, creating further congestion. It will lead to increased traffic on local roads - as either feeder roads or exits form the freeway.

Additional traffic on local roads will also occur though drivers seeking to avoid paying tolls.

Building tolled roads puts further financial pressure on people and families. It is likely that the tolls will rise faster than wages growth.

IP Address: cpe-60-227-247-112.nsw.bigpond.net.au - 60.227.247.112

Submission: Online Submission from Owen Fitzgerald (object)

[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228309](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228309)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link

[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link

[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf Of [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 9:23:06 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address:  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Content:

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex M4/M5 EIS, Project Number SSI 16\_7485.

#### SUBMISSION OF OBJECTION TO WESTCONNEX M4/M5 LINK EIS.

I write to wholly reject the proposed Westconnex m4/m5 link as detailed in the EIS, as well as earlier stages upon which this stage relies. We urge the Department to reject the proposal and offer the following justifications:

#### 1 CONTENT OF THE EIS

EIS Is effectively a 7,000+ page lie. It makes significant assertions on cost, time savings, urban design outcomes and delivery which are unsubstantiated and wildly variable.

As has been the case with many so-called State Significant Development, this EIS is Obfuscation masquerading as information, unable to provide the necessary long term benefits and assurances to benefit Sydney - and should be rejected.

Traffic growth in Sydney has been largely static since 2006, so why build any new motorways, let alone the orgy of motorways currently proposed, when we know that the addition of motorways are themselves the major inducement to increased car use?

Yet, dubious traffic modelling suggests that many urban roadways, namely the Anzac Bridge are already at 100% capacity. This assertion is a clear contradiction to the justifications offered for building Westconnex in the first place. Any rational proposal surely should have to prove that it does NOT add to the severity of current congestion, but reduces ACTUAL numbers, offering alternatives which relieve congestion in a socially, environmentally and financially responsible way.

Following on from this, current deformation of multiple intersection within 3km of St Peters interchange which will be beyond capacity demonstrate that Westconnex is to have detrimental impacts well beyond its immediate boundaries, at great cost. On basic assessment, this is wholly unacceptable.

The EIS is based on built in numbers / assumptions for northern beaches extension, but ignores actual committed actions such as Euston Rd / McEvoy St widening and merge, King St gateway, Anzac Pde / Alison Rd atrocity, widening of Gardeners Rd and other road upgrades, which are to be publicly funded by RMS, further increasing the direct and indirect costs and physical damage to the city.

## 2 TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Stage 3 does not make financial sense, doesn't post validate Stages 1 and 2. Justification is inadequate, and appears to run against the public interest, favouring that of the private.

The project appears to be driven by private profit not public interest, already indicated by the potential partial or whole sale before stage 3 is even underway. Private profiteering at the expense of good city planning, transport and environment is anti-democratic and risks long term damage to the urban environment, health, mobility and trust in government.

The delivery of private toll roads such as Westconnex guarantees profit for private operators, at expense of future NSW Governments and its citizens.

Does the privatisation contract or any other confidential document include a 'no competition' clause? What are the terms, and how will these be explicitly revealed to the public, who under representation of the government, appear to be bearing all of the risk?

How will the government guarantee that the fallout and subsequent costs are not left to public purse to remedy the failings of the privatised motorway?

## 3 URBAN DESIGN AND LIVEABILITY

No element of the EIS justifies this project on the basis of best-practice urban design. Motorways are mono-functional, and exclude critical ingredients of the city which are democratic and essential for quality city life. They are divisive and isolating, and their noise and pollution diminish amenity well beyond their immediate boundaries. Motorways are inappropriate urban places, and should be progressively removed to benefit the long term health and liveability of our cities, with available funding redirected to public transport projects.

Progressive cities around the world, including direct competitors of Sydney are doing the opposite to what is proposed for Westconnex:

- Paris has closed Right Bank motorway along the Seine and converted it into a promenade, returning alienated public land to people and multiple modes;
- Seoul removed its central motorway outright, and reinstated the river as public park and promenade providing quality environmental and recreation space; and
- San Francisco demolished its inner-city Embarkadero motorway, greatly enhancing the ability for the city to connect to its waterfront.

Increased traffic will impact directly on the ability to provide efficient and reliable bus services. The open wounds proposed will have dramatic effects on the ability to provide active transport opportunities, on street trees, on pedestrian amenity and on surrounding residential environments. Already disgraceful and unnecessary damage has occurred to Sydney Park, and loss of trees along Euston Road and Campbell Rd is an aggressive attack on the city. The direct loss of amenity, privacy, biodiversity and character are

but a number of outcomes which leave a lasting negative effect on the city. The ability of the city to fight urban heat island effect is greatly reduced, risking public health and putting critical infrastructure at risk - resulting in cost increases in other areas - i.e health. Many 100's of trees have already been lost for the construction of Westconnex, and this strategy should be halted and the severity of intervention thoughtfully considered to maintain and enhance the city's character, not eliminate it.

The indicative design for the Rozelle Interchange should be rejected, outright. The design is irrational and profligate, and completely inappropriate. The fact that Sydney Motorway Corporation has not been able to identify any other similar underground interchange project anywhere in the world or find a construction company to build it is an indictment. The EIS should be rejected because it would be absurd to approve such a design concept without evidence that it could be constructed. It would also be absurd to place conditions on a project for which even the most basic details are not known.

The EIS suggest a number of other profligate and inappropriate motorway extensions which are also undetailed:

- F6 - through much needed urban parklands, significant wetlands and residential neighbourhoods. This corridor is highly suited to public transport alternatives, such as metro, which can be much better integrated into the urban fabric and reduce ACTUAL traffic numbers;
- Western Harbour tunnel - which will draw increased numbers of trucks and vehicles to areas currently already feeling the pressure of congestion. This increased traffic will require significant numbers of unfiltered exhaust stacks - greatly diminishing local amenity and risking the health of tens of thousands of residents through its concentrated output; and
- Expressway to Northern Beaches - would introduce a motorway in place of a rapid public transport service to an area traditionally poorly serviced by public transport. It is imperative that the construction of a rail line providing frequent rail services be put well above that of a motorway for this region of Sydney.

#### 4 LACK OF ALTERNATIVES

SMC was required to consider alternatives. This section in the EIS is superficial at best and fails to provide for best practice, world class transport planning. A scant analysis of alternatives depicts a charade that treats the people of NSW, and future generations, as mugs. Sham assessment of other options, especially public transport alternatives, appears disingenuous and against best-practice.

The City of Sydney has recently generated a well thought out alternative plan which has been ignored in the EIS. This indicates the outcome has been decided, with the EIS offering no meaningful consultation or alternative to improve the proposal.

The SMC should be required to engage with the City of Sydney plan and to respond to it. Any responsible system of planning governance would require this. A number of further alternatives exist and should be fully explored before any motorway project is built:

- Demand management / reduction scenarios such as Congestion Charges, rather than tollways, have been ignored as alternatives. These systems exist worldwide and have been successful for decades;
- Metro rail. At the same NSW govt is building a metro line under the most traffic-affected areas of Alexandria, St Peters, Waterloo, but the there are no stops. No other city in the world is building 8km of metro line under densely populated areas without stations. There should be at minimum 3 additional stations between the proposed Waterloo stop and Sydenham. The lack of stations demonstrate a deliberate failure to increase coverage of the public transport system, which may in fact be holding up the dubious traffic numbers of Westconnex in this EIS;

Were stations appropriately built at the correct (world's best practice) distances, how many vehicles underpinning the justification of Westconnex would disappear?;

At a minimum, stations should be provided at St Peters serving also Sydney Park, Euston Rd in Alexandria and an Interchange with Green Square;

Why was Waterloo Station placed so close to the existing Redfern Station - where catchments overlap and recent and future renewal sites in East Redfern and Victoria Park are out of reach?;

- Duplication of Port Botany Freight rail line and inter-modals to substantially reduce truck movements. This is decades overdue, and a significant upgrade to freight services which are of a 3rd-world quality;
- Light rail lines - to serve the intensive increased density in East Redfern, Green square, Rosebery and linking anticipated uplift in the eastern suburbs currently lacking any structural rail options; and
- An integrated network of separated on street Cycle ways.

All of these real alternatives should be done in preference to any motorway construction, and this EIS rejected until all alternatives explored thoroughly. Each of these have the ability to REDUCE the mode-share of private vehicles and trucks, and return streets to manageable conditions where they function for multiple modes, the environment, and public life.

I urge the Secretary of NSW Planning to advise the Minister to reject this EIS, and publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission: Online Submission from [REDACTED] (object)

[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228323](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228323)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 10:44:31 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Irene Stariha (object)

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfIrene Stariha  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 9:39:03 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Irene Stariha (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Irene Stariha  
Email: irene.stariha@outlook.com

Address:  
101/29 Margaret St

Rozelle, NSW  
2039

Content:  
As a resident of Rozelle I'm extremely concerned about the Iron Cove tunnel and stack. The proposed unfiltered stack is very close to a Primart school as well as high density housing. This of course is of great concern for the health of hundreds of residents including young children. Where is any clear research showing how this will impact long term on the health of residents living directly around this polluted air?

Victoria Road is already a very heavily trafficked arterial road. To add to this with access from Westconnex can only cause intensive local gridlock. It is also very hard to clearly ascertain the effects of this on access to Terry St from Victoria Rd for both resident cars and pedestrian access crossing Victoria Rd to bus stops on either side. These stops are very busy and service a great number of residents. Is there a plan to include a pedestrian over ridge?

Traffic noise on Iron Cove bridge already travels to the high density apartments all around it. Increasing the number of cars traveling on this bridge will increase even further the constant noise experienced by residents. Are there any plans for resurfacing the bridge with quieter surface materials and sound barriers?

Creating more bottlenecks in highly populated ares and creating intense pollution output again in highly populated areas is no reslution to Sydney's traffic connection. It simply moves the problem from one spot to another. The health costs of whole communities is obviously a great social cost. It is also however a financial cost which no amount of toll revenue will fully cover.

Let's find solutions which take long term effects into account rather than short term quick fixes to gain political points.

Submission: Online Submission from Irene Stariha (object)  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228331](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228331)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 12:31:17 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Steve Clarke (object)

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfSteve Clarke  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 11:31:05 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Steve Clarke (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Steve Clarke  
Email: sc0274@gmail.com

Address:  
3 Rosemount Ave

Summer Hill, NSW  
2130

Content:  
I have witnessed firsthand the devastation wrought by the first phases of Westconnex: the destruction of heritage housing, trees and wildlife, the lack of any credible business, social or environmental case; the lack of any overarching town planning involving associated public transport infrastructure and open spaces, the lack of appropriate due diligence and care taken.

My eight year old child wrote: "I'm really upset. I was in Sydney Park and I saw Westconnex cutting down Eucalyptus and Melaleuca trees. But the main reason I'm upset is because the trees are home to birds. I saw the birds flying around in circles looking lost, confused and stressed. They would be very sad. Is there anything you can do to save the birds and the trees?

This project is doing irreparable damage and pain to the inner west community. It needs serious and major modification to repair the damage already done, and to ensure the health and wellbeing of inner west children and families.

IP Address: 123-243-6-197.static.tpgi.com.au - 123.243.6.197  
Submission: Online Submission from Steve Clarke (object)  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228371](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228371)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 12:44:05 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Helen Rees (object)

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfHelen Rees  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 October 2017 11:38:07 PM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Helen Rees (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Helen Rees  
Email: helenlucyrees@yahoo.com.au

Address:  
3 Rosemount Ave

Summer Hill, NSW  
2130

Content:  
Westconnex is a nightmare! It is hard to imagine a project more destructive to our community. It needs serious remediation.

IP Address: 123-243-6-197.static.tpgi.com.au - 123.243.6.197  
Submission: Online Submission from Helen Rees (object)  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228381](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228381)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Mon, 16 Oct 2017 13:21:12 +0000  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Submission Details for Nathan English of EcoTransit Sydney (object)  
**Attachments:** 228403\_ETS submission on Stage 3 WestConnex \_2017Oct17\_0001.pdf

**From:** system@accelo.comOn Behalf OfNathan English  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 17 October 2017 12:02:15 AM (UTC+10:00) Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Nathan English of EcoTransit Sydney (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Nathan English  
Organisation: EcoTransit Sydney (Co-Convener)  
Email: contact@ecotransit.org.au

Address:  
101 Darling Street

Balmain East, NSW  
2041

Content:  
Please find attached submission and send receipt - thank you!

IP Address: ppp121-44-67-222.bras1.syd7.internode.on.net - 121.44.67.222  
Submission: Online Submission from Nathan English of EcoTransit Sydney (object)  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_activity&id=228403](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_activity&id=228403)

Submission for Job: #7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_job&id=7485](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_job&id=7485)

Site: #3247 M4-M5 Link  
[https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view\\_site&id=3247](https://majorprojects.accelo.com/?action=view_site&id=3247)

## **A submission to critique**

### **THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT For WESTCONNEX Stage 3 (THE M4-M5 LINK)**

**Presented by  
EcoTransit Sydney**

**16 Oct 2017  
Authorised by the  
Executive Committee of  
EcoTransit Sydney**

**This submission consists of 25 pages  
(not including this one)**

**The content was prepared by:  
Mr Nathan English, Co-Convener,  
on behalf of  
EcoTransit Sydney**

**Contact for this submission:**

**Mr John Bignucolo (Secretary)  
C/- EcoTransit Sydney,  
PO Box 630  
Milsons Point,  
NSW 1565**

**Email: [contact@ecotransit.org.au](mailto:contact@ecotransit.org.au)**

**EcoTransit Sydney webpage: [www.ecotransit.org.au](http://www.ecotransit.org.au)**

# EcoTransit Sydney's Submission for the M4-M5 Link \*

## **<sup>1</sup>Introduction and Context:**

*EcoTransit Sydney* is Sydney's most outspoken public and active transport advocacy group. Our voluntary members led the charge for the Dulwich Hill light rail extension, opposed the CBD Metro and also the M5 East Tunnel, which would have destroyed the Wolli Creek Reserve.

Our organisation prides itself on providing a voice for the community which is often disenfranchised when it comes to the approval of so-called 'State Significant Transport Infrastructure'. The only thing which seems to qualify any infrastructure as 'State-Significant' in NSW these days, appears to be the size of its budget. If it's big enough, it instantly becomes 'State-Significant'. The EIS document for *WestConnex Stage 3: The M4-M5 Link*, details many things likely to be of 'significance' to the people it will ultimately affect, yet organisations like SMC, RMS and (sadly) even the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, may never consider such significant impacts as part of their terms of reference. To assess such multi-billion dollar infrastructure projects by such narrow economic scope is wrong – and it's why EcoTransit Sydney (and many other community groups) continue to hold a strong conviction that what we do has merit.

EcoTransit Sydney has never accepted the need for any part of WestConnex. By clear admission of its original (and rather loose) business case, it will only save a handful of minutes (on a good day) for those motorists who use it. In the Stage 3 EIS – the subject of this submission - all traffic modelling has been produced based on an assumption that the future Rozelle Interchange, the Western

---

<sup>1</sup> \* For the purposes of this submission, the M4-M5 Link is treated by EcoTransit Sydney as both the Rozelle Interchange Concept and the main Trunk Tunnels linking between Haberfield and St Peters.

Harbour Tunnel, the Northern Beaches Link and the Sydney Ports Gateway had also been completed – which is ridiculous, as these will not occur for years after Stage 3 has been completed.

This entire project seems to be more about the State Government transferring unprecedented amounts of hard-earned taxpayers' money to the private sector. This theory now seems confirmed enough, given the Government is making plans to sell its controlling stake of the Sydney Motorways Corporation as soon as possible – and straight after this EIS is approved. The timing of this seems political, as the project is now highly unpopular and a long way off complete.

We consider this project (from top to tail) to be a multi-billion dollar waste of money. It would seem the private sector agree, as they've left it to Government to get it started – absolving themselves of initial risk, until they're convinced it will pay off... It is yet to do so, and may not - except through its own recycling as an asset, to a naïve and most likely overseas-based buyer.

This was a project hatched on the back of an envelope by former disgraced NSW Liberal Premier Nick Greiner and his business mates. All of these people were unelected, but nonetheless became board members for *Infrastructure NSW [INSW]*. This spin-driven, 'independent advisory group', set up by yet another now disgraced former Liberal Premier, Barry O'Farrell (when relatively new in office), had been specifically tasked with delivering a *State Infrastructure Strategy*. This would be held up as an alternative collection of 'priority' State infrastructure ideas, compared to others already tested with some rigour by *Infrastructure Australia [IA]*. IA was the Commonwealth's advisory group, set up to test the merit of major infrastructure proposals hoping to gain Commonwealth funds for their completion. Most were considered to be 'State Significant' projects, submitted by the States themselves. We believe the creation of INSW was pure politics, to create an illusion of scrutiny for the O'Farrell Government's agenda, in an attempt to sidestep the Gillard-led Federal Labor Government's

scrutiny, via the established IA process. Gillard had committed funding for the Parramatta to Epping Rail-Link [PERL] – which had not gone through the IA process and was more a spare-of-the-moment election promise announced by the Prime Minister herself. Julia Gillard’s commitment to the PERL was seen as logical for Sydney’s future by most planners – connecting Parramatta to the northern arm of the Global Economic Arc, however the lack of scrutiny by IA gave O’Farrell a rather populist argument to justify going it alone. He rejected the Prime Minister’s offer of \$2.08 billion for PERL and created his own advisory board committing instead to his own election promise of the NWRL, which State Labor had cancelled several times over. The PERL made a hell of a lot more sense compared to other recommendations which would later be made by *Infrastructure NSW*. INSW supported O’Farrell’s plans to scrap the PERL, suggesting there were ‘far higher priorities’ - like WestConnex.

WestConnex was labelled by INSW as ‘priority number one for NSW’.

EcoTransit hereby condemns the O’Farrell, Baird and now Berejiklian Governments for ever adopting this project, particularly given the hypocrisy of proceeding with it despite independent scrutiny – free of conflicting interest - or any rigorous examination of the possible public transit alternatives which may well have negated its now questionable ‘need’.

WestConnex will *not* stop congestion, it will simply entice more road users onto bigger roads – owned by the private sector to make them profit. Stage 3 cannot possibly make a difference until the Rozelle Interchange is complete, as well as the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Northern Beaches Link and the Sydney Ports Gateway. In the very week leading up to the deadline for this EIS submission, it has become clear that the private sector appears reluctant to get involved in Rozelle Junction’s construction.

Vital rail additions would have been much cheaper and further reaching. We condemn the actions of Anthony Albanese (under Prime Minister Julia Gillard) for not demanding that his own established IA standards be followed. We further condemn the blind funding of \$3 billion by the Liberal Prime Minister who toppled the Gillard Government, Tony Abbott – well known for his fundamental view (published in his aspirational book) that roads are the only transport infrastructure the Commonwealth need fund – because '*the common man is his car is king*'... No Tony, not when the common man (and woman) are lumbered with ongoing tolls – their spare cash gone, their kids sick from pollution given how little opportunity they've been provided with for safe, active transit.

## **Reasons we urge you to reject this Stage 3 'EIS':**

Firstly, it is NOT an EIS! Surely it is not really able to be assessed as such, given half of the proposal is described as 'indicative only'. That half is the Rozelle Interchange – which includes a complex spaghetti junction of underground tunnels undermining the suburbs of Rozelle and Lilyfield, the Iron Cove Link tunnel and some proposed stub tunnels for proposed Western Harbour Tunnel. The City of Sydney has suggest it is so complex the interchange alone could cost up to \$3 billion and requires a new set of Australian road tunnelling standards to be written by the engineers which take it on – that could take some years. For such a cavalier proposal to be put forward for approval without any certain detail, given the understanding Rozelle Interchange would be one of the largest, deepest underground motorway concepts ever constructed – it seems Government is dipping Treasury's toe into the unknown – we don't traditionally tend to do that in NSW – and not on this scale...

It is imperative that the Department of Planning now takes a moment to pause and consider if this truly is a responsible time to consider this EIS. Surely it would be better to defer the assessment of the Rozelle Interchange, at least until the

detail for what's intended has been properly established – or be better still, to order the proponents to rewrite the entire EIS document. This should include realistic traffic modelling and air quality predictions, rather than those we see already, based on an assumption that all future proposed branches of WestConnex (the Western Harbour Tunnel, the Northern Beaches Link and the Sydney Ports Gateway) have been completed. These projects combined will add at least \$25 billion to the already blown out costs of WestConnex – and to make matters worse, we have no guarantee they will decongest Sydney! The health concerns, the rising cost of living (thanks to new tolls) and the continuation of car-dependency across the Sydney Basin will do nothing to help Sydneysider's generally. What sort of logic drives a statement which suggests that a benefit of this project will be the transferring of 45,000 people from public transport into cars? Yet that's what we witnessed in the first Business Case WestConnex released...

If the Rozelle Interchange were approved and constructed, then the ‘indicative only’ concept designs suggest we would see a twenty meter high exhaust stack rise just 80m from Rozelle Public School. This would tower even closer to residents and childcare centres along the Darling Street shopping strip and on setbacks from Victoria Road. If there is no wind, this exhaust will fall onto Rozelle’s heart – causing possible respiratory disorders. There will also be three major exhaust stacks built in the Rozelle Goods Yards. These will sit low in a suburban valley but tower over playing fields and so-called ‘new green space’. These will operate in close proximity to residents who live on the slopes that rim that valley, along with day-care centres and countless workers in the future Bays Precinct to the immediate north-east. Stage 3 suggests the dismantling of two key regional foot and cycle bridges will take place as part of the re-calibration of Victoria Road and the CityWest Link – we don’t know why this is necessary, but it will frustrate active transport – and could lead to people trying to cross these busy arterials in high traffic conditions to catch buses, etc. Stage 3 also suggests the total loss of an existing yet neglected rail corridor in

the Goods Yards which could otherwise carry a new service light rail to White Bay (were it reconditioned). Even if the old tracks are taken away – we advocate that the corridor they sit in be preserved for future light rail regardless. Finally SMC forecasts a 60% increase in traffic onto the Anzac Bridge heading into the CBD via the Western Distributor – if Stage 3 is built. This last point should prove striking for most Sydney motorists, as the Anzac Bridge is already at capacity in the peak periods, rated “F”. F is the worst rating one can give in NSW for congestion. Lucky for SMC, there is no technical ranking worse than “F” – so their modelling can't technically be described as worse for congestion – despite the increase in numbers... In practical terms, however, one does not need to be a traffic modeller to grasp how an increase of 60% traffic on Anzac Bridge will feel “completely F”, once all Stages of WestConnex are built.

In St Peters and Alexandria, RMS have plans for a lower exhaust stack than is standard – mainly because of an apparent need to keep airspace clear for passing passenger jets... This (like in the Rozelle Goods Yards) means poisonous pollutants will not disperse as far as they should given their proximity to residential areas... RMS also have plans to upgrade various fly-off roads such as Euston Road to cope with the influx of 60,000 additional vehicles per day in each directions. Euston Road to Dacey Ave will resembles an expressway, cutting a swathe across South Sydney, just a few blocks north of the Green Square Town Centre. It will end at Anzac Parade and Alison Road, where it seems expected to simply disperse via a ‘continuous flow intersection’ right where the new City South East Light Rail [**CSELR**] corridor will run, allowing motorists to access Moore Park directly. Is this really needed? EcoTransit Sydney believes not – far greater investments in quality public transport are what this city really needs. Any surface road plans like these we've just described here means Green Square (already Australia's densest neighbourhood and highly car-dependent) could be rimmed by the nation's worst traffic snarls on all sides! These could prove detrimental to active transport across the growing region, with amplified air and noise pollution – but it will also stifle public transport expansions

and spend money which most Councils wouldn't have the reserves for, on adaptation.

Lastly, this project (to link the M4 and M5) has become highly flawed and will not improve access to the Port Botany Freight Terminal or alleviate congestion on Parramatta Road to aid its liveability for urban renewal. These were the two key objectives when it was first proposed. This is because the only places where Sydney's M4 motorists can now get off WestConnex to access the CBD (if the Rozelle Interchange remains unfunded and unbuilt whilst the four lane wide trunk tunnels of the M4-M5 Link progress) will be Haberfield, either to run down the CityWest Link to reach the Anzac Bridge – or Parramatta Road. Both these options are exactly what city-bound M4 traffic already relies on.

For those who use the current M5 to reach the CBD, or even the North Shore, they will still be reliant on using the M5 East and Eastern Distributor – as is currently the case – for WestConnex Stage 3 will only spit them out at the St Peters Interchange.

Without the Rozelle Interchange (still only at concept design stage, given the details in this EIS have described it as 'indicative only') actually built – the M4-M5 Link's trunk tunnels will link nothing other than Haberfield with St Peters. Essentially, the trunk tunnels alone serve as nothing other than a glorified Sydney CBD bypass, but it's set to take motorists who pay its tolls nowhere new. This means that for all the money spent, WestConnex Stage 3 adds no real improvements to the Port or CBD access routes, but it will still toll motorists for the privilege of driving on their old motorways (the M4 and M5) which have now been widened somewhat. It also means local councils and RMS will be scrambling to find the money to upgrade their local roads, which will be forced to accommodate SMC's projected increases in traffic which is allegedly set to pour out of their motorway junctions. They may never find money to do this. At these points, pollution will increase around traffic portals, under exhaust stacks and

possibly even on some local roads, as many motorists will strive to avoid the new tolls – we see this already with the newly widened M4 (Stage 1 WestConnex). Sydney is already the most tolled city in the world, so this behaviour suggests SMC’s constant claims of surface traffic being greatly reduced could be false – if people need toll relief. If anything, because of the proven phenomenon known as ‘induced traffic’ – and the lack of additional access to desired locations for those who enter the M4-M5 Link trunk tunnels, traffic on surface roads may well increase...

In summary, it would appear there are virtually no long-term benefits that Sydneysiders can take away from this WestConnex Stage 3 proposal – at least which might benefit *them*. Sure, the selected construction firms which build it could employ lots of people for a few years, buy materials, etc... and someone in the private sector will be able to charge tolls once they purchase a controlling stake of SMC for decades to come – but it’s a long road to get one’s money back on that front... The question however, is whether that is ultimately the legacy which NSW should be striving for? This is not just a project which creates jobs. The pollution and disruption which will be created by WestConnex Stage 3 (according to independent experts) across the suburbs expected to host it, will have genuine long-term health impacts – which far outlast the jobs. We know this because similar construction techniques have already affected residents and property alike when it comes to the two previous stages of WestConnex. Western Sydney – in fact much of Sydney - will pay more in tolls, but for little gain. The projected time savings for Stage 3 (according to SMC’s own modelling) is minimal. To make matters worse, this project relies on more tollways being built to try and alleviate the new bottlenecks it creates - and if that’s what Governments deem necessary - it will spend the State’s budget well before we can dream of any alternatives to motoring. Why then, is THIS the proposal Government puts forth? Why, given the price, do we get THIS compared to world-class public transport expansion *first*? Why is the Government so insistent on spending vast sums of money upon WestConnex? And why is it the only

actual commitment they've made to substantial public transport investment – aimed at two projects only – the CSELR and the Sydney Metro project. Sydney Metro doesn't really expand rail capacity across Sydney Trains, it rather cannibalises and converts existing infrastructure and privatises its workforce. This is not a bang-for-buck approach when it comes to Transport Planning – and the implementation of the CSELR has seen it rise in cost to become one of the most expensive light rail developments in the world. Both Sydney Metro and WestConnex Stage 3 seem driven primarily by property developers wanting to takeover long swathes of Sydney; an economic ideology of user-pays project delivery; privatisation and a system which favours the needs of big party donors. The combinations of infrastructure we're now getting will not take people off Sydney's roads – not to the point that they flow freely for those who really have no choice but to use them (tradies, service delivery, freight, emergency services, parents making the school run, etc.).

As stated in the introduction of this submission, economic performance measures such as revenue generation and job creation cannot be the only determinants in deciding what is 'State Significant'... WestConnex has become too over-bearing for much of Sydney to be judged by such criteria alone – we must consider its long-term impacts to the city's urban liveability, freedom of movement, air quality, cost of living and think seriously about whether it will ever reach its once-stated objectives. Approval of Stage 3 will re-enforce this city's car-dependent nature for decades to come. The community has never been allowed to play a role in deciding if this remains the case – why? Why can't we have the discussion first, examining whether a different path might provide us with truly transformative public transport options to get people out of their cars where possible – and freeing up the comprehensive road system we already have. It's time - we urge the Department of Planning to weigh up the pros and cons of this project, possibly beyond the scope established, and remain responsible to the population's long-term needs.

## **Recommendations Moving Forward:**

As we've already said EcoTransit Sydney does not believe any part of 'Stage 3' WestConnex to be worthy of approval. Most certainly, it should not be approved without a truly thorough and transparent assessment of other competitive high-capacity public transport proposals, much like those we ourselves have been advocating for years. Whilst EcoTransit Sydney is not the only think-tank which promotes high-capacity rail alternatives and other ideas to get Sydney moving, we are one of the few not-for-profit groups who do so. We therefore believe our suite of suggestions are worth a look as they are free of commercial conflicts and devised to help find value-for-money concepts which will have truly transformative outcomes. We'd also suggest strengthening the frameworks which lead to infrastructure proposals being selected. You could start with this proposal – Stage 3 WestConnex...

### **IMPROVED GOVERNMENT PROCESS**

A hypothetical improvement when determining State Significant Transport Infrastructure, might be first be the issuing of a statement of intention. This could come from Cabinet and designed not to favour a specific mode, but rather highlight a specific problem which requires alleviation. This statement would then trigger an open critiqued by the *Department of Planning and Environment [DoPE]* to achieve adequate verification of the problem first identified. Upon verification of the problem, a combined Government panel would be established, consisting of *Transport for NSW [TfNSW]*, *Roads and Maritime Services [RMS]* and DoPE – along with any other relevant agencies. These would openly discuss which concepts on offer might bring about the most benefit – and after a selection of three is made, a feasibility study could be produced for each. The conclusion as to which is best to solve the problem would need to be unanimous, transparent, and a summary statement justifying the decision must be delivered to the *Greater Sydney Commission [the GSC]* for review. This GSC review must

be conducted transparently and promoted publicly, to ensure the conclusion is in line with *A Plan for Growing Sydney* (the living Metropolitan Plan) – and has a chance for public comment. If the summary statement's recommendation reflects the objectives of the Greater Sydney Commission and the ongoing nature of the Metro Plan as it expands – if public feedback is processed openly and addressed, then the GSC could refer the now *qualified* ‘State Significant’ infrastructure proposal for an independent assessment by *Infrastructure Australia*. This final assessment process should ensure that the highest functionality and greatest good is achieved – but beyond that, may achieve some Commonwealth funding to help get the project started. In such context, the terms of reference when establishing ‘the greater good’, should be a lower-cost of living for those using whatever transport proposals are chosen; an ability to increase neighbourhood liveability; increased energy efficiency and a reduction in our overall carbon footprint.

## DEMAND DRIVEN MODAL CHANGE

History and habit shows Sydneysiders foster high demands for motoring alternatives. This has been once again illustrated by the unpredicted yet undeniable patronage explosion on the new Inner West light rail extension; the removal of Station Entry Charges at Green Square and Mascot Stations on the Airport Rail Link; and the recent embrace of the Opal Card system, all of which is now obtainable in real-time data form – but not mentioned in the Stage 3 EIS.

Unfortunately, most of the transit data used to justify this EIS and the project it represents, date back to the 2011 Census and strategic reports which were often published no later than 2014. EcoTransit Sydney believes this is misleading and selective use of data, to define the needs of the study area across the Inner West and the City of Sydney. The Inner West light rail (for example), widespread Opal take-up and some major overhauls in the rail network’s timetabling have all occurred during or beyond 2014. This is yet another reason why we say this EIS

is inadequate, inaccurate and demands a re-writing before it can be properly considered by DoPE.

## LOW-HANGING FRUIT AND INFRASTRUCTURE OPTIONS

The Glebe Island Bridge is a heritage-listed RMS asset that has not been used since the late 1990s. We feel it should be re-furbished and opened to separated cycling and pedestrian traffic – as it promises to mimic the now essential active transit corridor of its cousin, the Pyrmont Bridge. EcoTransit Sydney notes the recalibration of active transit channels designed to access the Anzac Bridge above, as part of the future Rozelle Interchange means a major disruption of active transit is nigh. The EIS suggests two key active transit bridges will be removed, the Victoria Road footbridge at the corner of Lilyfield Road, and the Beattie Bush Bridge over the CityWest Link. The loss of these corridors is unacceptable unless equally (if not more) accessible corridors can be created and opened first. From Balmain, we propose that a fenced-off stretch of the new James Craig Road (an extension built between White Bay and Glebe Island). could serve as a relatively safe public and active transport corridor to Pyrmont and CBD from Balmain, via the Glebe Island Bridge and its creation would require very little effort.

The present Rozelle Rail Yards site holds remnants of a neglected surface rail corridor which runs from the Lilyfield light rail stop right up to the Victoria Road Bridge underpass. It's true the corridor holds little value unless the tracks are reconditions, but the land allocation for rail is potentially priceless, as still spans all the way to Glebe Island - and up the full length of White Bay. This corridor is an ex-freight rail line which was unfairly labelled as 'redundant infrastructure' by RMS in its REF for the recent and ongoing Rozelle Goods Yards "Works". We (and 1200 signatories to an online petition created by local Balmain Greens MP Jamie Parker), believe this old freight corridor needs to be reserved as a strategic land corridor, re-purposed for possible surface light rail expansion into

the future. In this respect it is no more ‘redundant’ than its parent line which once spanned to Dulwich Hill from Darling Harbour – converted to light rail only a few years ago - with stunning success and low cost. Its ‘redundancy’ is a matter of perspective – and RMS’ perspective is sadly limited to favouring roads, not rail. Various proposals for a light rail link to White Bay have been thrown around since at least 2006. In a report on the ‘future of the working harbour’ by Dr Phil McManus (commissioned by Leichhardt Council and ignored by Sydney Ports, now part of RMS) – it was stated that were this corridor not used, it would inevitably be lost. It is a question of equity for the residents and workers of the future Bays Precinct (and region surrounding) to intervene and take this possibility seriously. The sabotage of that rail link is highly likely – as it will be very hard to re-instate if WestConnex Stage 3 is approved, the Rozelle Junction is underway and it becomes completely erased the landscape. We feel this aging rail corridor deserves protection, because land in this part of town is at a premium and it could still provide a hardwired connection to the rest of the Inner West, Pyrmont and Central for the Bays Precinct and notably, White Bay. It could also become a much-needed and affordable compliment to any future Metro station in The Bays - which will likely require a much larger catchment of users to stay viable in its early years. The light rail to White Bay could feed passengers from across the broader region into this Station. Even without a Metro (which is still years away) a light rail extension through the Rail Yards site connecting The Bays with the Inner West light rail line, would be a major compliment to *that* project - and the future Victoria Road Bus Rapid Transit corridor (now in the planning phase). It would certainly become a crucial asset to the heavily populated and car-dependent Balmain Peninsula.

#### IMPROVED LIVEABILITY, PERMEABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL

We’re told in the EIS that the Rozelle Goods Yards will be redeveloped as largely public open space for recreation. Artists’ impressions suggest a ten-hectare park, this does not mean however, that SMC or the DoPE should feel obliged to

remove any other open space which exists across the Inner West – and especially not from around the Rozelle Rail Yards site. For example, the WestConnex concept pictures show the removal of green space at Buduwan Park (next to the Rozelle Bay light rail stop) to make way for a widening of The Crescent. This would be a highly unsatisfactory outcome for locals. If the Crescent must be widened to meet SMC's objectives, why wouldn't they be required to cover (or sink) that part of The Crescent, along with the rest of the Rozelle Interchange? Doing so would actually allow Buduwan Park to connect directly with the existing shoreline at Rozelle Bay - providing an uninterrupted and serene link to the Harbour for the community of Annandale. You could actually do this with the *entire* stretch of the CityWest Link too, from the James Craig Road turn-off, to Catherine Street. If SMC plan to cover the Rozelle Interchange with a park, then how is it beneficial to leave the existing CityWest Link exposed (like it currently is) for it would only continue to act as a noisy, unappealing pedestrian barrier for the suburb of Rozelle – denying residents easy seamless access to the very bay that bears their suburb's name. So too, does the lack of investment from the State to help finish the *Inner West Greenway* and a little-known project which could extend it to White Bay, called the *CityWest Cycle-Link [CWCL]*. The latter requires a very basic widening of the narrow rail cutting which already heads east from the Leichhardt North light rail stop (adjacent to Darley Road). This stretches towards Lilyfield's light rail stop, off Catherine Street. It's believed such a widening could be achieved easily with a basic road header for around \$5 million – or perhaps less. Such a modest investment could allow an extension of *The Inner West Greenway*'s off-road shared pathway, right into the Bays Precinct at a level grade. This means no more hills or traffic interruptions from the Cooks River all the way into Pyrmont (potentially) with the help of a re-animated Glebe Island Bridge. Such a dramatic improvement in cycling and pedestrian access would greatly enhance the appeal and safety of active transport across the Inner West. We therefore recommend that SMC (as a condition of any approval for Stage 3) be forced to make the entire Rozelle Goods Yards and CityWest Link areas (combined) into one big

seamless parkland, free of surface roads. Burying all roads would create some real opportunities to go well beyond the initial ten hectares initially promoted by RMS as a ‘possibility’. It would also provide a chance for uninterrupted cycling, walking and light rail extensions to the Balmain Peninsula and The Bays Precinct (adjacent), from the rest of the Inner West.

However, we feel the most important condition of approval, which really cannot be ignored, should be the full filtering of any proposed exhaust stacks which make up the WestConnex project – and that goes for all previous Stages too.

## HEALTH CONCERNS

A highly flawed, unconstrained, free-flowing traffic model system was adopted with plenty of assumptions that simply won’t reflect the realities of WestConnex Stage 3 for many years, if ever. Disgustingly, it appears this is also what the SMC air quality predictions were based on. They are wrong. The length of these tunnels (which the proposed Stage 3 stacks are catering for) will be longer than any previously built in Sydney. That means a greater concentration of traffic pollution could be measured wherever it’s released – as it will be drawn from a much longer underground source. For this project, the stacks will also be bigger and in some cases more numerous, particularly around the proposed Rozelle Interchange, where heavy emissions will blanket the surrounding high density residential areas drawn from several kilometres away and in multiple directions. This holds a high probability of affecting people’s health. We know from recent reports that the fastest growing area in greenhouse emissions for Australia today, involves the exhaust from new diesel powered cars. Diesel trucks are a given in WestConnex tunnels – particularly given the spoil trucks, cement trucks and trucks working on a possible Sydney Metro West in the years ahead - but the widespread production of diesel cars could lead to an increase in pollutants not previously factored in to SMC’s assumptions.

Diesel fumes are known carcinogens according to the World Health Organisation – some believe them to be as potent as asbestos. The Balmain Peninsula, attached to the Rozelle Goods Yards and what will continue to be (and most likely escalate as) a working port – already hosts a cruise terminal, where alleged low-sulfur fuels are being burnt by up to 150 passenger ships a year. All produce the equivalent of a shocking 200,000 cars (roughly) in pollution per day. This has been verified by Sydney Ports at a recent briefing – and that was considered one of ‘the lowest likely outcomes in pollution, for each dollar spent’. Add WestConnex pollution to the mix, in high concentration, and the Balmain Peninsula is set to become one of the worst residential areas for air quality in the Sydney Basin. The Peninsula itself is only a few kilometres from Global Sydney proper (both north and south CBDs). This means there’s a very real possibility that unfiltered emissions from the tunnels which are expelling them (at heavy concentration) will affect - if not take - people’s lives. This was verified by Professor Paul Torzillo (Executive Clinical Director and Head of Respiratory Medicine at Sydney’s Royal Prince Alfred hospital), who recently spoke at the City of Sydney’s “*Fix WestConnex*” *CityTalk* presentation (held on Wed Oct 11, 2017). According to a high-profile parent (Sunil Badami, who also gave a presentation at this event) SMC recently described the likely effects on Rozelle of traffic pollution generated from these proposed exhaust stacks in terms of a “percentage of child morbidity”. Morbidity is the frequency with which a disease might appear within a population. Morbidity rates are used in actuarial professions, such as health insurance, life insurance and long-term care insurance, to determine the correct premiums to charge to customers. According to Mr Badami, SMC was suggesting air quality might be measured in terms of “affecting 0.20 of a child’s morbidity”... This shows the heinous disregard SMC carries for the communities surrounding its project, when planning, investigating and trying to reach its objectives. For DoPE to be contemplating the approval of a project put forward by such an outfit, where the proponents process the world in this ghoulish way, says so much about what’s wrong with NSW Planning.

## EFFECTIVE FILTRATION A NECESSITY

Whilst there is much which would remain wrong with WestConnex, the filtering of exhaust stacks (were it to be adopted as a very serious condition of approval) might then allow the much lauded parkland RMS says SMC will build over the old Rozelle Goods Yards, to actually become a much improved, usable open space for the broader region – for as it stands, without effective filtration, it will not... It would also allow RMS and SMC to be seen as making an undeniable contribution to recreation for Inner Sydney residents – improving active transport permeability between suburbs and into The Bays Precinct. This might also enhance the appeal of future investors to build Mike Baird's much hyped 'innovation hub' at White Bay – if not more... We stress however, the health benefits of any filtration system would need to be studied first and proven.

We do stress, that if it is a viable option, then *all* WestConnex ventilation stacks *must* be filtered – they must. It's not a question of whether the law allows SMC to get away with not filtering them, it's a question of widespread public health. Filtering provides a way for you DoPE (and SMC) to avoid any future liability or class actions. Unfiltered stacks appear to pose a very serious health hazard. Filtering will make redevelopment of key sites near to WestConnex more appealing for investors – so why would it be responsible not to?

## ACTIVE AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS

If the DoPE can't insist on the whole CityWest Link from Catherine Street to The Crescent or better still, the James Craig Road turn-off, being covered by a new parkland - then DoPE should at least insist on numerous new bridges or viaducts to improve active transport access to and from the suburban destinations on either side. If SMC feels it *must* sacrifice the rail corridor in the Goods Yards completely, then a new Y-Junction viaduct (built off the existing embankment

which hosts Rozelle Bay light rail stop) could reinstate the very valuable rail link which would otherwise be lost to the Balmain Peninsula forever. Whilst the viaduct would primarily be designed to carry light rail over the CityWest Link and down to the underpass which runs beneath Victoria Road, it could also be used by pedestrians and cyclists. Take the intersection of Lilyfield Road and Gordon Street in Rozelle; a multi-purpose viaduct could link ‘at grade’ and ‘as the crow flies’ from Lilyfield Road to Pritchard Street in Annandale, allowing fast pedestrian access between these two estranged suburbs (see *Figure 1.0* attached).

## MULTIMODAL POTENTIAL FOR TUNNELS

Given the overall investment in WestConnex and the length of its underground tunnels, we would encourage *Transport for NSW* to revisit the project’s capacity to host trains within these tunnels, as part of a multi-model conversion. Doing this may help restore the uneven balance in State mode sponsorship, which has long favoured roads over rail. If it *is* possible to run trains through the WestConnex tunnels (either with or without the everyday traffic) then perhaps that’s what *should* be done instead. We recommend this exploration, because it may prove far cheaper than digging new tunnels to expand our rail network later – when valuable reserves are already spent. The *University of NSW* [UNSW]’s architecture studio ‘re-imagined’ WestConnex as an underground metro system, and demonstrated how this might function – which created much community interest. Even if SMC could team up with TfNSW and RMS to use mere bits of the dug tunnels for additional underground rail linkages, it may prove lucrative to do so...

If SMC succeeds in gaining approval for this highly flawed EIS – which we do not support - everything possible should be done to mitigate pollution and the impacts of any induced traffic spill-overs onto local surface roads.

Tolls should be kept to a minimum for locals, especially those living in the *Inner West Council* area which is being forced to host WestConnex Stage 3 – as well as the southern suburbs surrounding the *City of Sydney*. This is because if you proceed, these areas will find the new tolls very hard to avoid. The key junctions (and their tolled off-shoots) are right on the doorsteps to these area's suburbs – and some are likely to even interfere with local traffic movements.

WestConnex should not be encouraged as a freight network – or a concrete distribution network. A progressive Global city should be looking to use a rail network for such things, and after hours truck and van movements (first and foremost) to deliver bulk goods across Sydney. With this in mind, it could be possible be repurpose the tunnels already built, to move freight underground by rail – or you could simply expand the *Port Botany Freight Line* with the help of *Transport for NSW* and *IA*, to obviate the ‘need’ for so many trucks (of all sizes) on our suburban roads and key arterials. Government should also invest in more surface light rail connections between our existing heavy rail branches, better signalling systems and higher frequencies across the rail network as a whole.

#### DUMPING STAGE 3 AS AN OPTION

Government could simply re-allocate the entire budget for Stage 3 WestConnex (the M4-M5 Link) to build additional double deck heavy rail passenger lines where suburbs are screaming out for them. We are certain WestConnex (as a tollroad) will prove to be a poor investment for the public over the long term, especially when one weighs up the amount of surface road-space which cheaper, alternative transport measures might honestly free up for those who really need to use it. WestConnex (in such context) probably *wouldn't* be needed.

WestConnex Stage 3, as presented in this EIS, simply won’t achieve value for money – so why approve it? Our organisation stands shoulder to shoulder with all groups opposed to WestConnex Stage 3, given (like all previous and future

WestConnex stages) it's once again held up by SMC as a multibillion project that is accompanied by no sufficient evidence which suggest it can deliver on the Government's spin as to why it is needed. Stage 3 (we feel) is really about securing toll revenue for *Transurban* – a major party donor, and the delivery of concrete trucks across Inner Sydney - where urban renewal apparently proves its most lucrative... As a public transport advocacy group, committed to improving the liveability of Australia's only 'Global City' with its ever more compact population, we wish to see a decrease in motor-dependent transport – and this won't deliver it. We can't endorse WestConnex Stage 3, only offer the Government sensible alternatives, urge a rethink of their transport policy and perhaps comment on how best this abomination can be tweaked - if DoPE turns a blind eye to its dominant raft of flaws, and approves it.

Even if approved, The Premier's own business case for WestConnex states that the whole 33km network will be at capacity in just 8 years. This means WestConnex will leave cars snarled in traffic jams – where we are now, essentially. During construction, cars will face congestion on local roads from the sheer number of additional truck movements the project is expected to demand. So there will be eight years of pain and disruption, followed by eight years of WestConnex operating – before it reaches capacity. Is this a joke? Given the price of the project, how is could it possibly be considered responsible for DoPE to approve Stage 3? For a start, Stage 3 makes absolutely no sense without the guarantee of a Rozelle Interchange being built at the same time as the planned trunk tunnels, or without the addition of a completed Western Harbour Tunnel, a Northern Beaches Link, a Sydney Gateway to the Port in Botany, etc., etc., etc... SMC's arguments would no doubt continue until they'd also built an F6 to Sutherland! WestConnex started as a project which could take surface traffic off Parramatta Road, allowing it to be traffic calmed and turned it into a high-end urban boulevard for Sydney with high density ideal living and long-term job creation all the way along it. WestConnex was budgeted at \$10billion, now it's morphed into a tollway network which will do nothing for Parramatta Road and

looks set to spend in excess of \$45 billion for little long-term gain – and little urban renewal possibility. It threatens the success of The Bays Precinct, as we saw with the withdrawal of Google from negotiations for the White Bay Power Station, it will increase air pollution and demand for motoring – which benefits only the owner operators of WestConnex – who get to charge tolls for 43 years, increasing at CPI or 4% per year, whichever is higher.

## CONCLUSION

The logic driving Sydney's motorways seems insatiable. It's as if Australian's are being sold all the romance of the great open road, through unbridled country – but the reality is we're mostly a market which lives in the city. We are being conned with spin-driven promises to get rid of traffic lights and bypass whole regions – to spend our savings on tolls to get back an hour a day or more – only we won't, according to the modelling... At the cost we're seeing, is such a project sustainable? The Government's lust for tollways over all other modes of transport (modes which could truly decongest this city – as proven elsewhere around the world), seems morally more and more corrupt by the day. NSW does not have enough assets in reserve to keep this approach going – to take this once in a generation *risk*, so we (as a city) have to be wise with how we spend the money we have gained from the sale of the poles and wires... If we're not, WestConnex could fail – and that will simply be wasted cash amounting to intergenerational theft.

Whilst some dispute whether it was Einstein who once said: 'Insanity is doing the same thing over and over again, but expecting a different result,' the wisdom of this statement seems assured and appropriate for Sydney. The approach of building big tollways to alleviate traffic is just crazy. According to Jane Jacobs

(who battled Robert Moses for the preservation of New York – and won) it also kills what we love about our established cities... We now know about the phenomenon of ‘induced traffic’, we know now that more road space leads to more people driving, which makes the situation worse at the point of every bottleneck. We know WestConnex Stage 1 is already open and costing up to \$2,200 a year for those in Sydney’s West who use it five days a week. We know we stare into the abyss of a massive energy disruption, and our elected leaders are staring back, blankly. We know right now, were we all to suddenly switch to electric vehicles – it would cause the collapse of base load power. Because of this failure to transition, we know that fossil fuels are still here for a while. When electric cars, still in the price range of luxury vehicles, there is a natural trend occurring where diesel powered vehicles are now being bought en masse and therefore, their emissions will be affecting our air quality for sometime too... All of this suggests that WestConnex will lead to more pollution, with higher concentrations of diesel, a higher cost of living for many and a poorer State as a result of its build – particularly if the private sector gets cold feet and the Premier can’t gain the price she’s wanting for its sale... Thus, whether the logic was Einstein’s or not, the quote seems entirely appropriate for this submission to urge Sydney planners to try something new other than further tollway expansion – and yes, that includes across Western Sydney too.

Three quotes Einstein for sure said, were:

*“Concern for man and his fate must always form the chief interest of all technical endeavors. Never forget this in the midst of your diagrams and equations.”*

*“It has become appallingly obvious that our technology has exceeded our humanity.”*

*“Any intelligent fool can make things bigger and more complex... It takes a touch of genius – and a lot of courage to move in the opposite direction.”*

*We urge you apply a little of the man’s genius in your assessment of this project. Just because it might be possible to build a ludicrously expensive tollways system, hinging on an unprecedented spaghetti junction underground doesn’t mean it’s the right things to do.*

From EcoTransit’s perspective – but also the perspective of most we’ve met who have come to have an informed view of this project, it seems truly unnecessary to build this Stage 3 WestConnex tollway – especially when it could fund so much more public transport, for the same price... Now that the Government is fast-tracking the sale of SMC to off-load WestConnex – and the NSW Auditor General is running its second audit into the project, it’s almost as if this proposal is a dog no one wants to care for, and which needs to be put down... DoPE could do that by refusing to approve this EIS, that would offer taxpayers some mercy...

If not, if DoPE insist on dancing to the Government’s WestCON tune, and it approves Stage 3 (however unsatisfactory and indicative its design), it will lock NSW into a trajectory which will not sustain its Global economy or liveability. It will open the gates for the private sector to waste billions more of our dollars to build a larger traffic bottle that only ends with much the same sized neck. There will be no real access improvements, yet the future owner operator will be allowed to charge people who use this tunnel system exorbitant amounts. Why? Why sanction this development which lets a private enterprise collect tolls even though the people had paid their taxes? Our fear is that were you to approve this, history will judge the Government as both unfair and ridiculous – an DoPE, as a department that no longer holds purpose or power.

We do not say this lightly – and we do not say it out of arrogance, the facts are Sydney finds itself at the pointy end of the deal now – no doubt - and the EIS (which is the subject of this submission) was never worthy of progressing this far in the state its currently in. We are certain that the facts speak for themselves on this – and our view will be back by thousands of other submissions, which will take the time to explain that which we have not. We feel a truly integrity-based department, which knows its purpose and power – its role in protecting the State from poor choices in development, should be able to offer frank and fearless advice to a Minister who frankly, should know better.

We are confident DoPE will recognise the futility of this WestConnex Stage 3 proposal (the M4-M5 link) and hopefully agree with our assessment as a whole...

Until then, we can only make the recommendations we now have.

Thank you for the ability to comment.

Nathan English

Co-Convener,  
EcoTransit Sydney

Resident of Balmain,  
Member of the Bays Community Coalition.




Figure 1.0 Possible public and active transit links across the future Rozelle Rail Yards site.




Figure 1.1 Possible EcoTransit Sydney alternatives to WestConnex



Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>NATHAN ENSELEY</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Address: <i>101 DARLING ST</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Suburb: Postcode <i>BONNIE</i>
<p><b>Please include / delete (cross out or circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</b></p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>	

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 this stage of WestConnex which doesn't benefit western Sydney in any way because it doesn't even include the links to Port Botany or Sydney Airport that were the main justification for the original WestConnex project.
- B. The money spent on this stage could have been spent on modernizing the railway signal system so the train service could be improved which would benefit the communities west of Parramatta. What commuters out west really need is an extension of the heavy rail train system. I object that we were never given a choice about it.
- C. The high tolls are set to increase 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.
- D. The KPMG and Ernst & Young studies cited by the EIS say NSW's toll roads contributed \$14 billion in benefits over ten years but there are NO details. Of course they benefitted Transurban which owns most of them but that is not the same as the public interest in efficient transport, reduced vehicle emissions and reduced traffic. Now we are building more tollways to "reduce" traffic congestion, emissions etc. Why is the answer to traffic jams always another road, and now a private tollway? WestConnex is not a solution and I object to the use of public money to enrich a private corporation.
- E. The EIS has to admit that the impact of 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. And this fact is not even considered or factored into the traffic analysis.
- F. 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 new roads. They are doing the exact opposite, so the tolls don't seem to have anything to do with traffic management. And we have already seen motorists abandoning the new M4 for Parramatta roads because the new tolls are so high.

I demand that the Planning department 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 *Nathan Enseley* 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: Chris Lee

Signature: Chris Lee

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

Address: 144 Young St

Suburb: Annanade 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: ..... *Chris L*

Signature: ..... *Chris L*

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

Address: ..... 144 Young St

Suburb: ..... Arncliffe Postcode..... 2088

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 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.
- 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.
- 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 all vegetation will be removed on the site which includes a mature tree. I object to the removal of the tree which creates a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the tree is removed it must be replaced with a mature tree as soon as the remediation of the site commences.
- 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 on this site.
- 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.

**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: <i>Denise Thompson</i>
	Address: <i>73 Hill St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>DTh</i>
Please include 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:

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 has many caveats and depends upon further steps (such as traffic management plans), the detail of which is not provided. The community has no certainty that any of the impacts from construction will be managed to an acceptable level.
3. 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.
4. 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)
5. 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)
6. There are 36 homes identified as having severe noise impacts during construction in Leichhardt and Lilyfield. No noise barriers have been identified so residents are unable to comment as to whether this impact will be reduced. No proposal for alternative accommodation is provided. This is unacceptable and all of the proposed noise mitigation options should be detailed in the EIS so that residents have an opportunity to comment on what is proposed. (Executive Summary xvii)
7. There is no plan to manage traffic on Darley Road proposed in the EIS. This critical arterial road is regularly congested at peak periods. Reference in the EIS to developing a traffic management plan in the future is not acceptable. The detail of what is proposed needs to be contained in the EIS so that residents can assess whether the impact of 170 light and heavy vehicle movements a day in and out of the site can be acceptably managed.

---

**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: <i>Denise Thompson</i>
	Address: <i>73 Hill St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>DTh</i>
Please include 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:

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: <u>Denise Thompson</u>
	Address: <u>73 Hill St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Heichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <u>DT</u>
Please include 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:

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 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.
3. The impacts in the EIS are misleading because they do not include any detail of the cumulative impact caused by the overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 (of up to one year). 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 multiple WestConnex projects. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure. Nor does the EIS provide for any traffic management to prevent rat running during the period of construction, when Stages 1 and 2 have opened. The EIS should not be approved without this detail and adequate plans to manage this impact.
4. 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)
5. The EIS states that all vegetation on the Darley Road site will be removed. This includes a mature large tree which provides a visual and noise barrier from the City West Link. The tree should not be permitted to be removed.
6. Despite the fact the EIS identifies over 30 homes with severe noise impacts, no mitigation is mandated. While the possibility of noise walls is flagged, along with in-home treatments, none of this is a requirement. Nor is any detail provided on which residents or business owners can comment. 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: <i>Denise Thompson</i>
	Address: <i>73 Hill St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>DT</i>
Please include 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:

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. 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. The EIS does not mention that 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

---


**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: Denise Thompson  
Signature:   
Please include / exclude (circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.  
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  
Address: 73 Hill St  
Suburb: Heichhardt 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.

- (1) *The Hawthorne canal, which is the closest waterway to the Darley Road site, is described in the EIS as a 'sensitive receiving environment'. (Executive Summary, xix). Darley Road is a contaminated site with asbestos and the water treatment plant to be established during construction proposes running water from the treatment plant directly into the waterways. The permanent water treatment plant will involve water from the tunnel discharged to local stormwater systems and waterways, therefore this is a permanent impact. This proposal will further compromise the quality of the waterway and impact on the four rowing clubs in close vicinity.*
- (2) *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 on this site.*
- (3) *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.*
- (4) *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.*

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: Denise Thompson  
Signature:   
Please include / exclude (circle) my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.  
I HAVE NOT made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  
Address: 73 Hill St  
Suburb: Leichhardt 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.

- 1) 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 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.
- 2) 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 pedestrians.
- 3) 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).

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Denise Thompson</i> Address: <i>73 Hill St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>DTh</i>
Please include 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:

1. I object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. I object 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.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically provide that all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
4. 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.
5. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed or any detail provided. 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 uninhabitable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
6. The EIS does not even 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.

---

**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: <u>Denise Thompson</u>
	Address: <u>73 Hill St</u>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <u>Heichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: 
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:

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 as it will create unacceptable noise impacts for the community and lead to traffic chaos, along with creating an increased risk of accidents to pedestrians and cycle users.
2. The substation and water treatment plant proposed for Darley Road should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link so that it is less visible to residents. 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. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the acknowledged constraints of the Darley Rd 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, as pertains to the Darley Road site, needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.
4. At the conclusion of the construction period, the Darley Road 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 approval conditions need to mandate that the Darley Rd site is to be preserved as green space or other community purposes at the conclusion of the construction period.
5. No trucks (heavy or light) should be permitted on any streets adjacent to Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street). A blanket prohibition should be in force with respect to any worker vehicles from the construction site parking on these local streets. These homes will already suffer the worst construction impacts and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and the additional noise impacts of additional cars on their street. These local streets are not designed to handle heavy vehicle movements. Therefore, any approval conditions need to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all local streets adjacent to Darley Road.
6. Any approval conditions and the relevant construction contracts must require that all workers to the Darley Rd site are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail, with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads adjacent to the Darley Road site. The site currently provides only 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.

**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: <i>Denise Thompson</i>
	Address: <i>73 Hill St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>DT</i>
Please include 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:

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. The period of construction proposed is unacceptably long. Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years while the EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This period creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.
3. 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. The EIS states 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.
4. No truck movements should be permitted on Darley Rd or any local roads in Leichhardt or adjoining suburbs. 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 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. I object to the selection of the Darley Rd site altogether, but propose this alternative, which appears to represent the least worst impact, should be chosen if this site is to be used.
5. I object to the number of truck movements proposed at the Darley Road site. The EIS states that there will be 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, as is currently provided.
6. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets and provide a plan for enforcement (to be paid for by SMC and not by the Inner West Council).

---

**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:..... <i>Denise Thompson</i>	Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001
Signature:..... <i>DThompson</i>	Attn: Director – Transport Assessments
Please <u>include / exclude (circle)</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.	Application Number: SSI 7485 Application
Address:..... <i>73 Hill St</i>	Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Suburb:..... <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode..... <i>2040</i>	

**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

#### Ambient air quality:

- I. 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.

#### IRON COVE AREA:

- II. 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)

#### Worker car parking – Leichhardt;

- III. 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 reference to 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.

#### Accidents:

- IV. We 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. The traffic forecasts indicate that Darley Road will have 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day. 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. The addition of hundreds of heavy truck movements a day into that intersection will increase the risk of serious accidents for both pedestrians and drivers. The EIS states that the levels of service are expected to Darley Road is directly next to the North Leichhardt Light Rail stop which is a pedestrian hub. Children travelling to school walk to the stop. Active transport users such as bicycle riders will be at risk, along with pedestrians using Canal Road to access the Bay Run, Leichhardt pool and the dog park.

**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: ..... *Denise Thompson* .....  
Signature: ..... *DT* .....

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: ..... *73 Hill St* .....  
Suburb: ..... *Leichhardt* ..... Postcode: *2040* .....

- The EIS states that the 'main risks' during construction would be associated with dust soiling and the effect of airborne particles and human health and amenity (xii). This will affect local air quality. There is no detail as to how this will be managed other than covering the spoil under an acoustic shed (of low grade). It is likely the Dan Murphys building has asbestos which creates additional risk during the demolition process.
- 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, nor 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 3-4 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.
- 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 documents state

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

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.

- 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 pedestrians.

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

Name: ..... *Venkates*

Signature: ..... *[Handwritten 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: ..... *600 Pitt St* Postcode: ..... *2000*

Suburb: ..... *Pyrmont* Postcode: ..... *2000*

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

- # 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)
- # 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)
- # The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.
- # 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)
- # 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 construction and operation of the project will result in 51 property acquisitions. We object to the project in its entirety because of this impact. We note that a number of long-standing businesses have been acquired and that many families and businesses in earlier stages have been forced to go to court to seek fair compensation. We object to the acquisition in particular of the Dan Murphys site. The business was substantially renovated and a new business opened with full knowledge of the likely acquisition. We object to it being acquired and compensated in this circumstances and call on the Government to investigate the circumstances which led to this occurring (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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: *Vernon C*

Signature: *[Handwritten 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: *2077 St Georges Rd*

Suburb: *Eastgardens* 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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- # 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.
- # 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.
- # 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 all vegetation will be removed on the site which includes a mature tree. I object to the removal of the tree which creates a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the tree is removed it must be replaced with a mature tree as soon as the remediation of the site commences.
- # 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 on this site.
- # 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.

---

**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: ..... *Veronica Dyer*

Signature: ..... *Veronica Dyer*

*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 Leichhardt Street*

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- 4 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.
- 4 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.
- 4 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.
- 4 No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- 4 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.

---

**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: *John S*

Signature: *John S*

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

Address: *144 Young St*

Suburb: *RENNANDALE* Postcode: *2038*

- 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.
- 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.
- 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

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

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.

- No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents to not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- 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.

**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: ..... *Marion Michael*

Signature: ..... *[Handwritten signature]*

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

Address: ..... 92 Booth Street

Suburb: ..... Annandale Postcode ..... 2038

- 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.
- 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.
- 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

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

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.

- No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- 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.

**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: Bethinda Bolden

Signature: Bethinda Bolden

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 m. Idon St

Suburb: Kings Langton Postcode: 2071

- ◆ 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.
- ◆ 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.
- ◆ 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 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2017
- ◆ The EIS states “that without the ‘construction scenario’ the City West Link/The Crescent and The Crescent/James Craig Road intersections are forecast to operate satisfactorily at LoS D or better in both Peak periods. With the ‘construction scenario’ the operational performance at the intersections is forecast to worsen”. And after 5 years of construction and the

spending of more than \$18 Billion the outcome at these locations will be worse.

- ◆ 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.
- ◆ 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

**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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

Attention Director Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001	Name: <i>Jon STERNBECK</i>
	Address: <i>98 FRANCIS St</i>
Application Number: SSI 7485	Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>
Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link	Signature: <i>J Sternbeck</i>
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 selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. 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. The EIS does not mention that 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

---

**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: ..... *R. Scron*

Signature: ..... *R. Scron*

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: ..... 87 FRANCIS ST

Suburb: ..... CATCHMARDY Postcode..... 2090

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

- 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.
- 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.
- The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically mention all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
- 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 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.

---

**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: ..... *R. Syron*  
Signature: ..... *R.S.*

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: ..... *87 FRANERS St*

Suburb: ..... *LECCONY PARK* Postcode ..... *2090*

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

- 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: ..... *R. Sopron*

Signature: ..... *R. Sopron*

*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: ..... 87 FRANCIS St

Suburb: ..... CETCHMARDY Postcode ..... 2090

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

- 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)
- 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)
- The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.
- 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)
- 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 construction and operation of the project will result in 51 property acquisitions. We object to the project in its entirety because of this impact. We note that a number of long-standing businesses have been acquired and that many families and businesses in earlier stages have been forced to go to court to seek fair compensation. We object to the acquisition in particular of the Dan Murphys site. The business was substantially renovated and a new business opened with full knowledge of the likely acquisition. We object to it being acquired and compensated in this circumstances and call on the Government to investigate the circumstances which led to this occurring (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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: ..... *R. Scawen*  
Signature: ..... *R. Scawen*

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: ..... 87 FRANCIS ST  
Suburb: ..... COTCHMARDT Postcode ..... 2000

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

- 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.
- 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 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.
- All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to falls Street) should have a blanket 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. These streets are not constructed for heavy vehicle movements and on this basis should also be ruled out. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements including parking) and worker parking on all of these streets.
- 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 spaces 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 Darley Road site should be rejected because it involves acquiring Dan Murphy's. This business was renovated

---

**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: ..... *R. Syron* .....  
Signature: ..... *R. Syron* .....

*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: ..... *87 FRANCIS St* .....  
Suburb: ..... *LEITCHMARDT* ..... 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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- 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.
- 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.
- 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 all vegetation will be removed on the site which includes a mature tree. I object to the removal of the tree which creates a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the tree is removed it must be replaced with a mature tree as soon as the remediation of the site commences.
- 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 on this site.
- 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.

---

**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: ..... *R. Sawyer*  
Signature: ..... *R. L.*

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: ..... 87 FRANCIS 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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents to not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- 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.

---

**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:	<i>Robert Spear</i>		
Organisation:			
Address:	<i>87 Francis St</i>	Suburb	<i>LEICHARDT</i>
Email:	<i>Sparswerg@optusnet.com.au</i>		
Post Code		<i>2040</i>	
<p>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / No</p> <p>Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p>			

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

#### **Non-compliance with SEARS**

I object to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

In so far as it describes the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt the EIS does not meet this requirement because it does not describe the components and activities that have been described to the community either in meetings with LAW (Leichhardt Against WestConnex) or at the WestConnex Community Reference Group established by Sydney Motorway Corporation.

The EIS has been released before the proponent is able to describe how it actually plans to carry out construction activities at Darley Road, Leichhardt, in particular the plan for staging the arrival of spoil trucks.

The proponent via its agent Sydney Motorway Corporation's employee Peter Jones has advised on several occasions that spoil haulage trucks will be staged from the Sydney Ports land on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. This is to avoid the situation at Haberfield where trucks circle the Northcote St site as they are not able to queue to enter it creating congestion and noise impacts as they drive slowly into Wattle St and Ramsay St. before making a second run at the Northcote St site from the Parramatta Road entrance.

No details of this staged spoil haulage proposal at Darley Road, Leichhardt are provided other than that 'construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt via the westbound lanes of City West Link'.

Peter Jones from Sydney Motorway Corporation has advised that he is in the process of finalising an agreement with Sydney Ports which will enable him to stage trucks from a location on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. The EIS should not have been released before this plan was finalised. Peter Jones has advised that he is only required to describe the 'worst case scenario' in the EIS, which is trucks arriving ad hoc via the eastbound lanes of City West Link. The EIS should describe what the proponent actually plans to do as well as the worst case scenario so that the impacts of all options being considered can be assessed and commented on.

It is not clear from the EIS how the alternative plan for the staged arrival of spoil trucks from Sydney Ports will be documented and how stakeholders will have an opportunity to assess its impacts. The EIS does not specifically state that this staged arrival plan will be documented in the CTAMP, the Ancillary Facilities Management Plan or the Preferred Infrastructure Report.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it does not comply with the SEARS.

#### **Construction vehicle safety impacts**

I object to the EIS because the proposal in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt stated therein, that 'heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt' presents unacceptable safety and amenity impacts.

The corner of Darley Rd (actually James St) and the City West Link is a pedestrian zone for:

- Pupils of Orange Grove Public School who live in Leichhardt
- Students of Sydney Secondary College, Leichhardt Campus who alight at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Students of other schools along the light rail who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Commuters who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Residents walking to Leichhardt Park Aquatic Centre and adjacent sporting facilities
- Residents walking to the Orange Grove markets on Saturdays

The proponents plan brings pedestrians and school children in particular directly into the path of spoil haulage trucks at an intersection found to be the third most dangerous according to Transport for NSW figures.

A further impact will be to discourage people from walking in this area leading to greater car use for local trips.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the above grounds.

**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:	<i>Robert Syron</i>		
Organisation:			
Address:	<i>81, FRANCIS ST</i>	Suburb	<i>LETCHMARDT</i>
Email:	<i>r.syron@bigpond.com.au</i>		
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.			

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

#### Hours of operation

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'Spoil handling associated with tunnelling supported by the Darley Road civil and tunnel site would occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Spoil would be handled below ground wherever practicable to reduce the potential for amenity impacts in adjacent areas. Spoil handing at the surface outside standard day time construction hours would occur within an acoustic shed to manage potential amenity impacts. Spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours, between 7.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'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. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS because the proponent/contractor would only have to keep local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would have no right to limit works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. As we have seen with other stages of WestConnex this leads to devastating impacts for residents who must endure significant periods of exposure to out of hours works which involve noise, lights and disturbance.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

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:	<i>Robert Syron</i>		
Organisation:			
Address:	<i>81 François St</i>	Suburb	<i>LEICHHARDT</i>
Email:	<i>[Signature]</i>		
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.			

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


#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft noise and construction noise

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and the aircraft noise which the residents near the site already endure.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airservices Australia reports that in April to June 2017 the number of average daily noise events over 70 dBA. In Leichhardt this is an average of 16-17 per hour over the peak morning period and 16 per hour in the early evening peak period.



I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel engine, exhaust and potentially air brake noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours.

**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:                                                                                  | <i>Robert Syron</i>        |          |                   |
| Organisation:                                                                          |                            |          |                   |
| Address:                                                                               | <i>81 FRANCIS St</i>       | Suburb   | <i>LEICHHARDT</i> |
| Email:                                                                                 | <i>R.Syron@bigpond.com</i> |          |                   |
| 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.   |                            |          |                   |

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

#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft emissions and spoil truck emissions

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of emissions from spoil truck vehicles from its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and emissions from aircraft to which residents near the site are already exposed.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airplane exhaust, like car exhaust, contains a variety of air pollutants, including sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Many of these particles of pollution are tiny, about a hundred millionths of an inch wide, or smaller than the width of a human hair. So-called particulate matter that's especially small is the main culprit in human health effects, especially since the particulates can become wedged deep in the lung and possibly enter the bloodstream, scientists say.

Exposure to loud noise from living under a flight path over a long period of time may increase the risk of developing high blood pressure or having a stroke, a 2013 study by researchers at the University of Athens suggests.

Researchers examined data from 420 people living near busy Athens International Airport in Greece and found living with high noise levels from aircraft, especially at night, was associated with high blood pressure.

Every additional 10 decibels of night-time aircraft noise appeared to result in a 69 per cent increased risk of high blood pressure, also known as hypertension.

The researchers at the University of Athens found that around half the participants (just under 45 per cent) were exposed to more than 55 decibels of daytime aircraft noise, while around one in four (just over 27 per cent) were exposed to more than 45 decibels of night-time aircraft noise.

Only around one in 10 (11 per cent) were exposed to significant road traffic noise of more than 55 decibels.

Between 2004-6 and 2013, 71 people were newly diagnosed with high blood pressure and 44 were diagnosed with heart flutter (cardiac arrhythmia), while a further 18 had a heart attack, the researchers found.

I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because in addition to the existing aircraft emissions and noise experienced by people living near the site, this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel exhaust emissions and noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours. This will give rise to increased health risks from noise and air pollution which research suggest will cause increased blood pressure and risk of stroke.

**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:                                                                                  | Robert Syron  |          |            |
| Organisation:                                                                          |               |          |            |
| Address:                                                                               | 81 Francis St | Suburb   | LEICHHARDT |
| Email:                                                                                 | R.law         |          |            |
| 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.   |               |          |            |

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

## Pedestrian and cyclist movements

- **I object** to the EIS because it fails to describe the temporary changes to Darley Road, Leichhardt to enable access to and from the ancillary facility that would likely be required in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be decided by the contractor.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that:

'Temporary changes to Darley Road to enable access to and from the ancillary facility would likely be required. These may include changes to line marking to provide a temporary turning lane for construction traffic and temporary diversions to the pedestrian path on the northern side of Darley Road. These would be confirmed during detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor and in consideration of the safety and function of the road network, maintaining access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop and providing for continued pedestrian and cyclist movement.'

It is not clear how continued access, pedestrian and cyclist movement will be preserved and I am concerned that the impacts have not been correctly identified and assessed by the proponent.

**I object** to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. **I object** to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor.

## **Light rail access**

- I object to the EIS because it does not guarantee that the existing access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop would be maintained at all times. Fig 6-4 indicates that only the eastern access will be maintained. This greatly disadvantages the elderly and disabled who have to walk up a steep hill to the eastern access. If the proponent cannot guarantee access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop from the existing entry points or from points that are accessible to all then the Darley Road, Leichhardt construction site should be abandoned. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on users of the Light Rail.




Figure 6-4 Project Footprint – Map 2

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

Name: ..... *R. Sawyer*  
Signature: ..... *R. Sawyer*

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: ..... 87 FRANCIS 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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- We 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

---

**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: <i>Hubert Syron</i>                                                                                                                                                                    | Organisation:                                  |
| Address: <i>87 Francis St</i>                                                                                                                                                                | Suburb <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Post Code <i>2040</i> |
| Email: <i>R.L.Syron@bigpond.com.au</i>                                                                                                                                                       |                                                |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website      Yes / No<br>Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years. |                                                |

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

#### Truck routes

- I object to the EIS because it suggests that no local roads would be used by heavy vehicles during works yet at the same time acknowledges that spoil trucks may use local roads in exceptional circumstances which include when there is queuing to get into the site. Darley Rd is highly congested with traffic queues forming during much of the day which will lead to queues to enter the site. Queuing will not therefore be an exceptional circumstance and the result will be that spoil trucks are able to use local roads without being in breach, which will be often. This is unacceptable to residents of Francis, Hubert, William and Charles St and I object to the EIS on this basis. As queuing cannot be avoided on Darley Rd this clearly shows why this location is inappropriate. The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?
- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site, which SMC have on many occasions told the community they are contemplating as alternatives.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that 'It is anticipated that the majority of construction traffic would enter the site from the southern (westbound) carriageway of Darley Road, Leichhardt via new driveways. Heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt. A temporary right turning lane at the intersection of City West Link and Darley Road, Leichhardt would be provided for use by construction vehicles. Heavy vehicles would exit the site by turning left onto Darley Road, Leichhardt before turning left onto City West Link.'

'Construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) via the westbound lanes of City West Link.'

'Temporary traffic management measures would be established to enable access and egress arrangements. These would be detailed in a CTAMP, which would be prepared to manage construction traffic associated with the project.'

I object to the proposal for vehicles associated with spoil haulage to travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Rd. This proposal is dangerous and the impacts and risks are too great. Darley Rd is acknowledged by RMS to be a sub-standard road in terms of its construction. The intersection from the city west link is a steep blind turn even for traffic coming across from James St. This is followed by immediate left hand turns into both Francis St and Hubert St. A number of properties on Darley Rd would be at risk of destruction from spoil haulage trucks in the event of a truck having to brake suddenly to avoid stationary vehicles.

The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be detailed in the CTAMP, Preferred Infrastructure Report or Ancillary Facilities Management Plan.

Peter Jones of SMC has on many occasions made representations to the community that his plan is to stage trucks from the port and eventually when possible to have them arrive and depart from the site underground when a tunnel is established between Leichhardt and the M4 East. He has also said that loading of spoil would take place underground at this time. He has recently told us of his plan to load trucks from a ramp off the city west link by means of a hopper conveyor which would pass over the Light rail station delivering spoil into silos below which trucks would pull up to receive their load. The laden trucks would then travel west bound along the city west link. None of this plan is detailed in the EIS.

I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I object to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into the CTAMP, PIR or AFMP on matters which will have a devastating impact to me and to residents near 7 Darley Rd.

**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: <i>Robert Syrok</i>                                                                            |                          |                       |
| Organisation:                                                                                        |                          |                       |
| Address: <i>87, ST FRANCIS ST</i>                                                                    | Suburb <i>LEITCHARDT</i> | Post Code <i>2040</i> |
| Email: <i>R.L.Syrok@bigpond.com.au</i>                                                               |                          |                       |
| 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.                 |                          |                       |

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 impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has not provided details of the noise mitigation measures proposed in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. As a result it is not possible to assess the noise impacts of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. It is unacceptable for the proponent to establish a major construction site in the middle of a residential area without a clear plan for mitigating noise impacts.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) 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. In addition, temporary noise mitigation measures may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings, which would be provided to minimise noise impacts on surrounding properties.'

Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) will create a high level of noise impact for residents yet the proponent has not given details of the plan for mitigating this impact. The measures will be implemented only if 'reasonable and feasible' which is a subjective assessment as it does not state whether they will be assessed as reasonable from the standpoint of the proponent or the residents. What the proponent thinks is reasonable may not meet the residents expectation as to what is reasonable. The measures appear to be optional as the proponent only states that 'may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings'.

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has not provided a clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts from work within and outside of standard construction hours at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the fact that the demolition of 7 Darley Road, Leichhardt will remove a significant noise barrier to traffic noise from the City West Link. This will mean increased traffic noise impacts to the residents of Darley Rd, Francis St, Hubert St and Charles St.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of fully laden spoil haulage trucks exiting the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt driving up the very steep blind turn at the intersection with the City West Link. The RMS should install noise measuring equipment and monitoring cameras at this location to measure noise from heavy vehicles and identify vehicles whose noise exceeds the applicable Australian standard.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of spoil haulage trucks using air brakes on the descent down Darley Rd off the City West Link. Heavy vehicle drivers should avoid using exhaust brakes, engine compression or 'jake' brakes near residential areas and noise-sensitive areas such as hospitals and schools, unless they are necessary for safety reasons. RMS should implement noise limits from engine compression brakes and should use roadside noise 'cameras' as an aid to enforcement at every location where WestConnex vehicles emitting engine compression brake noise might affect nearby communities.

**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:                                                                                                                                                        | RACHELE O'REILLY |        |            |
| Address:                                                                                                                                                     | 58 MARION ST     | Suburb | LEICHHARDT |
| Post Code                                                                                                                                                    | 2040             |        |            |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / <input type="checkbox"/> No |                  |        |            |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                                         |                  |        |            |
| Signed:                                                                                                                                                      | Rachael O'Reilly | Date   | 29/9/17    |

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". There are many Sydney Water pipes and Council stormwater drains in the site footprint. These are vulnerable to damage. A burst water main or broken pipe leading to water being cut off is inevitable. If the planned electrical works take place to establish a power supply to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt then disruption of power, NBN and telecoms is also inevitable. **The proponent should be required to have a plan in place to keep residents' power on and to keep residents connected and should communicate this plan to residents. The plan might include portable**

WIFI devices or compensation for disruption. There must be a disincentive to causing disruption. **The proponent should be required** to have a plan in place for a burst water main which includes immediately relocating residents and providing a secondary source of water.

**The proponent should be required** to plan for a secondary source of water so that there is no disruption of supply. Residents should be kept informed regularly about how work is going to impact them.

|                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                           | Name: <u>RACHELE O'REILLY</u>                  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                        | Address: <u>58 Marion St</u>                   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                           | Suburb: <u>LEICHHARDT</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                                                                                                                                | Signature: <u>Rachele O'Reilly</u>             |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 (following 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**

Submission in relation to: Application Number - SSI 7485

Application name - WestConnex M4-M5 Link

|                                                                                                                                                              |                                          |                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Name:                                                                                                                                                        | <i>RACHELE O'REILLY</i>                  |                     |
| Address:                                                                                                                                                     | 58 MARION ST<br>Post Code<br><i>2040</i> | Suburb LEICHHARDT   |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / <input type="checkbox"/> No |                                          |                     |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                                         |                                          |                     |
| Signed:                                                                                                                                                      | <i>Rachele O'Reilly</i>                  | Date <i>29/9/17</i> |

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**

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

|                                                                                                                                          |                              |                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name: <b>RACHELE O'REILLY</b>                                                                                                            | Address: <b>58 MARION ST</b> | Suburb <b>LEICHHARDT</b> |
| Post Code<br><b>2040</b>                                                                                                                 |                              |                          |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |                              |                          |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                     |                              |                          |
| Signed: <b>Rachele O'Reilly</b>                                                                                                          | Date <b>29/9/17</b>          |                          |

### **Impact of MOC1 on local area**

I oppose the plan for a water treatment plant and an electrical substation to remain on the site of 7 Darley Rd Leichhardt after tunnel construction is complete.

This Motorway Operations Centre 1 (MOC1) is a completely inappropriate use of a site in a residential area with particular characteristics.

The character of Leichhardt is heavily influenced by the street pattern (predominantly north/south extending from Parramatta Road) and built form. The wide carriageways and regular street pattern combined with the topography and a predominance of single storey detached housing gives Leichhardt a more open character than that of Glebe or Annandale. The suburb is made up of several distinctive residential neighbourhoods including Excelsior Estate, Helsarmel, Piperston and West Leichhardt. The subject site is within the Helsarmel Distinctive Neighbourhood that is located on the northwest slope of the Leichhardt/Balmain ridge. The Helsarmel Distinctive Neighbourhood is predominated by low scale detached and semi-detached cottages that demonstrated a variety of architectural styles and building materials. Many of these dwellings are Federation or post-war styles, with scattered examples of Californian bungalows and workers cottages.

The desired future character as set out by Council is to maintain the character of the neighbourhood by keeping development complementary in architectural style, form and materials and preserve the low scale cottage character. The suburb profile allows for contemporary development that is complementary to the streetscape.

The MOC1 proposal for a tunnel water treatment plant and an electrical substation is inconsistent with the character of the neighbourhood. This is a residential neighbourhood and what is proposed will permanently degrade our neighbourhood. MOC1 will be a prominent and unwelcome eyesore.

**The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt and the proposed Motorway Operations Centre 1. The proponent should identify alternatives locations for water treatment and a substation including at the alternative dive site locations. The proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.**

**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:                                                                                                                               | RACHELE O'REILLY |        |
| Address:                                                                                                                            | 58 MARION ST     | Suburb |
| Post Code                                                                                                                           | 2040             |        |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No |                  |        |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                |                  |        |
| Signed:                                                                                                                             | Rachel O'Reilly  | Date   |

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

- **Contaminated site**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

7 Darley Road is a site which has been reported to the NSW EPA under section 60 of the CLM Act. Although NSW EPA assessed the site as not requiring regulation under the CLM Act in 16.2.14 of the EIS the proponent sets out in Table 16-15 the contaminants of potential concern that are present at Darley Rd. These are metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, total recoverable hydrocarbons, asbestos and Volatile Organic Hydrocarbons (SVOCs).

The proponent's plan for the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt involves demolition, earthworks, construction and track-out (the transport of dust and dirt from the construction/demolition site onto the public road network on construction vehicles).

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of contaminants will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.

- **Asbestos contaminated site**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

Appendix R, 4.7.8 Areas and contaminants of concern the proponent states that 'There is also potential for asbestos to be present in the fill from potential uncontrolled filling and demolition of former buildings.'

The proponent's assessment is defective as it fails to identify the risk to local residents and anyone else in the neighbourhood of excavated soil containing contaminants and asbestos being blown into nearby streets and into homes and gardens of adjoining properties. The proponent's assessment is defective because having identified the presence of asbestos on the site it fails to specifically identify the potential for inhalation of asbestos either by workers or residents.

**I object** to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of asbestos will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.

|                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                                  | Name: <i>RACHELE O'REILLY</i>                  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                               | Address: <i>58 Marion St</i>                   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                                  | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link                                                                                                                                                    | Signature: <i>Rachale O'Reilly</i>             |
| Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br><b>Declaration :</b> 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                           | Name: <u>RACHELE O'REILLY</u>                  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                        | Address: <u>58 MARION ST</u>                   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                           | Suburb: <u>LEICHHARDT</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                                                                                                                                | Signature: <u>Rachele O'Reilly</u>             |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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..
- 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**

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

|                                                                                                                                                            |                  |                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Name:                                                                                                                                                      | RACHELE O'REILLY |                   |
| Address:                                                                                                                                                   | 58 MARION ST     | Suburb LEICHHARDT |
| Post Code                                                                                                                                                  | 2040             |                   |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |                  |                   |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                                       |                  |                   |
| Signed:                                                                                                                                                    | Rachele O'Reilly | Date 29/9/17      |

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

- **Air quality – exhaust emissions**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable. In particular I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site because of the impact it will have on health.

In 9.3 'Construction assessment methodology' of the EIS the proponent states that one of the main air pollution and amenity considerations at demolition/construction sites is increased concentrations of airborne particles and NO<sub>2</sub> due to exhaust emissions from on-site diesel-powered vehicles and construction equipment. In 9.3 the proponent also states that '**Exhaust emissions from on-site plant and site traffic are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality, and in the majority of cases they would not need to be quantitatively assessed.**'

This assessment is incorrect in the case of the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site in Leichhardt and the Department of Planning must require the proponent to submit an assessment.

The proponent sets out elsewhere in the EIS its plan to run spoil trucks in and out of the site via Darley Rd/James St.

A full laden truck and dog driving up the steep blind section of Darley Rd/James St will have to use high gears and high revs to get up the hill. This will take longer than for other vehicles because of the size of a truck and dog and the extensive traffic queuing that takes place at the intersection. The proponent anticipates there being a truck every 4 minutes in peak hour which coincides with the peak of foot traffic near the intersection. This means a truck every traffic light cycle. This will create unacceptable concentrations of diesel exhaust in an area used by a lot of pedestrians to get to and from the North Leichhardt light rail stop.

The Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site in Leichhardt should not be allowed to proceed because of the health impacts from diesel exhaust.

|                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>PO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                            | Name: <u>RACHELE O'REILLY</u>                  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                        | Address: <u>58 MARION ST</u>                   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                           | Suburb: <u>LEICHHARDT</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                                                                                                                                | Signature: <u>Rachele O'Reilly</u>             |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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**

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

|                                                                                                                                                              |                  |              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Name:                                                                                                                                                        | RACHELE O'REILLY |              |
| Address:                                                                                                                                                     | 58 MARON ST      | Suburb       |
| Post Code                                                                                                                                                    | 2040             |              |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / <input type="checkbox"/> No |                  |              |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                                         |                  |              |
| Signed:                                                                                                                                                      | Rachele O'Reilly | Date 29/9/17 |

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 vibration 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".

**The Department of Planning and Environment should require the proponent to adopt the approach taken by the Crossrail project in the UK which is to publish the noise mitigation policy before the project begins and to identify who will be entitled to mitigation. It is unacceptable that all of these negative impacts have been identified, inadequate**

mitigation proposed and little effort made to plan as to how these impacts will be managed throughout the project.

**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:                                                                                                                                                | RACHELE O'REILLY | Suburb:    | LEITCH HARDY |
| Address:                                                                                                                                             | 58 MARION ST     | Post Code: | 2040         |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |                  |            |              |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                                 |                  |            |              |
| Signed:                                                                                                                                              | Rachele O'Reilly | Date:      | 29/9/17      |

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 ensure that the conditions of any approval are stringent and prohibit out of hours work at the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt for more than 2 nights in a row and in any two-week period.**

|                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                           | Name: <u>RACHELE O'REILLY</u>                  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                        | Address: <u>58 MARION ST</u>                   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                           | Suburb: <u>LEICHHARDT</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link                                                                                                                                             | Signature: <u>Rachelle O'Reilly</u>            |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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**

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

|                                                                                                                                     |                  |                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Name:                                                                                                                               | RACHELE O'REILLY |                   |
| Address:                                                                                                                            | 58 MARION ST     | Suburb LEICHHARDT |
| Post Code                                                                                                                           | 2040             |                   |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No |                  |                   |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                |                  |                   |
| Signed:                                                                                                                             | Rachel O'Reilly  | Date 29/9/17      |

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** ensure that the conditions of any approval are stringent and should require the proponent to pay a pre-determined amount of ex gratia payment to residents for each night of disturbance. This should be sufficiently high to deter extended periods of out of hours work at the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt.

**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:                                                                                                                                                      | <i>RACHELE O'REILLY</i> |                          |
| Address:                                                                                                                                                   | <i>58 MARION ST</i>     | Suburb <i>LEICHHARDT</i> |
| Post Code                                                                                                                                                  | <i>2040</i>             |                          |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |                         |                          |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                                       |                         |                          |
| Signed:                                                                                                                                                    | <i>Rachele O'Reilly</i> | Date <i>29/9/17</i>      |

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

**• Asbestos contaminated site**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

The proponent in identifying the potential contamination impacts at Darley Road states that:

'Previous soil investigations identified fill material with slightly elevated metals and PAHs, although the site is still suitable for ongoing commercial/industrial land use. A UST has also been decommissioned. If present and not appropriately controlled, there is potential for:

- Direct contact, inhalation and ingestion risk to site workers from contaminated soil or hazardous building materials via dust
- Discharge of contaminated surface water to the stormwater system and ultimately Hawthorne Canal and Iron Cove
- Incorrect handling or disposal of spoil
- Disturbance of actual or potential acid sulphate soils at the western end of the site which could impact local soil and water quality.

The proponent's assessment is defective as it fails to identify the risk to local residents and anyone else in the neighbourhood of excavated soil containing contaminants and asbestos being blown into nearby streets and into homes and gardens of adjoining properties. The proponent's assessment is defective because having identified the presence of asbestos on the site it fails to specifically identify the potential for inhalation of asbestos either by workers or residents.

**I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of asbestos and other contaminants will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.**

|                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                                 | Name: <i>RACHELE O'REILLY</i>                     |
|                                                                                                                                                                                              | Address: <i>58 MARION ST</i>                      |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                                 | Suburb: <i>LEICHARDT</i> Postcode <i>NSW 2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link                                                                                                                                                   | Signature: <i>Rachele O'Reilly</i>                |
| Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br><b>Declaration:</b> 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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 \_\_\_\_\_

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Attention Director</b><br/>Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br/>Department of Planning and Environment<br/>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name:<br/>WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> | <p>Name: <u>Cathy Riemer</u></p> <p>Signature: <u>Riemer</u></p> <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.<br/><u>I HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>27 Munn St</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Newtown</u> Postcode <u>2042</u></p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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) 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 following 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
- b) 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.
- c) 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
- d) 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 for 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 \_\_\_\_\_

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Attention Director</b><br/> <b>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application</b></p> <p><i>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br/> Department of Planning and Environment<br/> GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</i></p> <p><b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b></p> | <p>Name: <i>Karen Tappin</i></p> <p>Signature: <i>[Handwritten signature]</i></p> <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <i>35 Bowral ST.</i></p> <p>Suburb: <i>2042 NEWCASTLE</i></p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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 extensive damages 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 is 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: Praya Punwani

Signature: Praya Punwani

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: 15 Tesla Street

Suburb: Chatswood Postcode 2067

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Darley Road is confirmed as a 'civil and tunnel site (dive site) with a 'Motorway Operations' site at one end for machinery during the build and will then house permanent water treatment facilities, despite evidence tendered to the Concept Design explaining that this intersection has an high accident rate and is completely unsuitable for such a purpose.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?
9. I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
10. 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.

Other Comments :

**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: LORRAINE CURNOU  
 Signature: Lorraine M Curno

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: 542 CHAPEL ROAD  
 Suburb: BANKSTOWN Postcode: 2200

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 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 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.
- 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.
- 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 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.

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,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 | Name: <i>Cate MEDCUTTER</i><br>Signature: <i>Cate Medcutter</i>                                                                                                                                            |
| Attention: Director – Transport Assessments                                                                   | <small>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.</small> |
| Application Number: SSI 7485<br>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                       | Address: <i>42 Hubert St</i><br>Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i>                                                                                                                             |

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

- ❖ Worker car parking – Leichhardt: 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 reference to 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.
- ❖ Accidents – Leichhardt: 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. The traffic forecasts indicate that Darley Road will have 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day. 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. The addition of hundreds of heavy truck movements a day into that intersection will increase the risk of serious accidents for both pedestrians and drivers. The EIS states that the levels of service are expected to Darley Road is directly next to the North Leichhardt Light Rail stop which is a pedestrian hub. Children travelling to school walk to the stop. Active transport users such as bicycle riders will be at risk, along with pedestrians using Canal Road to access the Bay Run, Leichhardt pool and the dog park.
- ❖ Traffic – Leichhardt: I object to the location of the Darley Road civil and construction site because the site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. It is already congested at peak hours and the intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

---

**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: ..... *Elizabeth Hank*  
 Signature: ..... *EDark*

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: ..... 15 Taylor St  
 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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- We 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                                                                                   | Name: MARIL ROBERTSON                                                                         |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Address: 29 PROSPECT ST                                                                       |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Suburb: ESKLINE VILLE Postcode 2045                                                           |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Signature:  |
| <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration :</b> I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |                                                                                               |

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 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Darley Road is confirmed as a 'civil and tunnel site (dive site) with a 'Motorway Operations' site at one end for machinery during the build and will then house permanent water treatment facilities, despite evidence tendered to the Concept Design explaining that this intersection has an high accident rate and is completely unsuitable for such a purpose.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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 ?
- ❖ I completely reject this EIS due to its failure to consider the alternative plan put forward by the City of Sydney.
- ❖ 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 \_\_\_\_\_

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Attention Director</b><br/> Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br/> Department of Planning and Environment<br/> GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> | <p>Name: MARIL ROBERTSON</p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Please <u>include</u> / <u>delete</u> (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.</p> <p>Address: 29 PROSPECT STREET</p> <p>Suburb: Erskineville Postcode 2043</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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

- I. 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?
- II. 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.
- III. 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.
- IV. 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.
- V. 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.
- VI. 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.
- VII. 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.
- VIII. 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.
- IX. 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.
- X. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Submission from:</p> <p>Name: <u>MARIE ROBERTSON</u></p> <p>Signature: <u></u></p> <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</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.</p> <p>Address: <u>29 PROSPECT STREET</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>ERSKINEVILLE</u> Postcode <u>2043</u></p> | <p>Submission to:</p> <p>Planning Services,<br/>Department of Planning and Environment<br/>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Attn: Director – Transport Assessments</p> <p>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|


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.

- 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.
- The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 ?
- 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.
- 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.
- 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?
- 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 \_\_\_\_\_


|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Attention Director</b><br/> <b>Application Number:</b> SSI 7485 Application<br/> <br/> <i>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br/> Department of Planning and Environment<br/> GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</i><br/> <br/> <b>Application Name:</b> WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> | <p>Name: <u>MARY ROBERTSON</u></p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>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.</p> <p>Address: <u>29 PROSPECT STREET</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>ENSWILLY</u> Postcode <u>2043</u></p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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

- ❶ 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.
- ❷ The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.
- ❸ 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.
- ❹ 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.
- ❺ 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.
- ❻ 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 ?
- ❼ 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.
- ❽ 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.
- ❾ 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?
- ❿ 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).
- ❻ Other comments

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                                                                                   | Name: <u>MARL ROBERTSON</u>                                                                   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Address: <u>29 PROSPECT ST</u>                                                                |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Suburb: <u>ERSKINEVILLE</u> Postcode <u>2043</u>                                              |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Signature:  |
| <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration :</b> I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |                                                                                               |

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:

- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.

---

**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,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 | Name: <i>Stale Ales</i><br>Signature:                                                                                                            |
| Attention: Director – Transport Assessments                                                                   | <small>Please include / delete (cross out or circle) 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.</small> |
| Application Number: SSI 7485 Application<br>Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                       | Address: <i>S/29A Bay Rd</i><br>Suburb: <i>Waverton NSW</i> Postcode <i>2080</i>                                                                                                                                                  |

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. 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.
2. No road junction as large and complex as the extraordinary spaghetti junction proposed to go underground has been built anywhere in the world. The feasibility is not tested. There are no international or national standards for such a construction.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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).
8. 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.
9. I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.
10. 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.

Other Comments :

---

**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 \_\_\_\_\_

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Attention Director</b><br/> <b>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application</b></p> <p><i>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br/> Department of Planning and Environment<br/> GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</i></p> <p><b>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</b></p> | <p>Name: <u>Jane Durrle</u></p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Please <u>include</u> / <u>delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <u>16 wells St</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Newtown</u> Postcode <u>2042</u></p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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

- a . 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.
- b . No road junction as large and complex as the extraordinary spaghetti junction proposed to go underground has been built anywhere in the world. The feasibility is not tested. There are no international or national standards for such a construction.
- c . 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.
- d . 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.
- e . 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.
- f . 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.
- g . 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).
- h . 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.
- i . I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.
- j . 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.

---

**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: Enagh Minakos

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: 3 clarke st

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- No road junction as large and complex as the extraordinary spaghetti junction proposed to go underground has been built anywhere in the world. The feasibility is not tested. There are no international or national standards for such a construction.
- 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 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 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).
- 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.
- I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.
- 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 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. 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 mechanical ventilation proposed depends on single direction tunnel construction, so how it can possibly work for large curved tunnels on multiple levels is unknown.
- OTHER :

---

**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: Marcia Leedey  
 Signature: Marcia Leedey

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: 50 Anisworth 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 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.
- ✿ 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?
- ✿ The EIS states that by 2033 Ross St will see an increase of 80 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. The greatest increase of Heavy vehicles at the PM peak will be in Johnston Street, which will see an increase of about 30-50 vehicles when compared to the 'without project' scenario. At Catherine St there will be an increase of 30 heavy vehicles a day at Peak periods. These streets will see a huge increase in Heavy vehicle movements if Stage 3 is built. The increase would be roughly half this amount if the project did not go ahead. Annexure Fig 26 B2 Section H
- ✿ 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.
- ✿ The Air quality data provided in the EIS 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.
- ✿ 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.

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

Name: KRISTEN DUNPHY

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: 16 Cheltenham St  
 Rozelle  
 Suburb: Postcode 2039

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 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. No spoil truck movements should be permitted on Darley Road and 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
- ◆ I 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.
- ◆ 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 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.
- ◆ 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.
- ◆ 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 following 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.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Submission to : Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001<br><br>Attention: Director – Transport Assessments<br><br>Application Number: SSI 7485<br>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link | Name: DAVID TAYLOR<br>Signature: D.Taylor<br><small>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.</small><br>Address: 3/310 Elsnick St North<br>Suburb: Leichhardt      Postcode 2070 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 | Name: DAVID TAYLOR<br><br>Signature: D. Taylor                                                                                                                                       |
| Attention: Director – Transport Assessments                                                                   | <i>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> |
| Application Number: SSI 7485<br>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                       | Address: 3130 Elswick St North<br>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

- Worker car parking – Leichhardt: 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 reference to 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.
- Accidents – Leichhardt: 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. The traffic forecasts indicate that Darley Road will have 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day. 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. The addition of hundreds of heavy truck movements a day into that intersection will increase the risk of serious accidents for both pedestrians and drivers. The EIS states that the levels of service are expected to Darley Road is directly next to the North Leichhardt Light Rail stop which is a pedestrian hub. Children travelling to school walk to the stop. Active transport users such as bicycle riders will be at risk, along with pedestrians using Canal Road to access the Bay Run, Leichhardt pool and the dog park.
- Traffic – Leichhardt: I object to the location of the Darley Road civil and construction site because the site cannot accommodate the projected traffic movements without jeopardising the road network. Darley Road is a critical access road for the residents of Leichhardt and the inner west to access and cross the City West Link. It is already congested at peak hours and the intersection at James Street and the City West link already has queues at the traffic lights. The only other option for commuters to access the city West Link is to use Norton Street, a two-lane largely commercial strip which is already at capacity. The addition of hundreds of trucks and contractor vehicles will result in traffic grinding to a halt and traffic chaos at this critical juncture with commuter travel times drastically increased.

---

**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: Louise Sree

Signature: Louise

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

Address: 12 Melton St

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

- ✓ 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.
- ✓ 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 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.
- ✓ All of the streets abutting Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to falls Street) should have a blanket 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. These streets are not constructed for heavy vehicle movements and on this basis should also be ruled out. The EIS needs to prohibit outright truck movements including parking) and worker parking on all of these streets.
- ✓ 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 spaces 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 provide 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 Darley Road site should be rejected because it involves acquiring Dan Murphy's. This business was renovated and opened with full knowledge that it was to be acquired. The lessee and sub-lessees should not be permitted

**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: ..... Louise Skeel .....

Signature: ..... Auntie Louise .....

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

Declaration : I

Address: ..... 12 Weston St .....

Suburb: ..... Sydney ..... Postcode ..... 2046

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

compensation in these circumstances. The demolition of the entire building (which the EIS confirms will occur) is wasteful and represents mismanagement of public resources.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                   | Name: <i>Clarey Wooddell</i>                |
|                                                                                                                                                                                | Address: <i>12 Holmwood St</i>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                   | Suburb: <i>Newtown</i> Postcode <i>2042</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                                                                                                                        | Signature: <i>G.Wooddell</i>                |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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?

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                                            | Name: <i>Glenys Waddell</i>                 |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Address: <i>12 Hornsway St</i>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485                                                                                                                                                                            | Suburb: <i>Newtown</i> Postcode <i>2002</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                                                                                                                                                 | Signature: <i>G.Waddell</i>                 |
| <p>Please <b>include</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |                                             |

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 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.
2. 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)
3. 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.
4. Why is there no detailed information about the so called 'King Street Gateway' included in the EIS ?
5. 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

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

|                                                                                                                                       |                |           |  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|--|
| Name:                                                                                                                                 |                |           |  |
| Organisation:                                                                                                                         | <i>Private</i> |           |  |
| Address:                                                                                                                              | Suburb         | Post Code |  |
| Email:                                                                                                                                |                |           |  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website      Yes / <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |                |           |  |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                  |                |           |  |

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

#### Pedestrian and cyclist movements

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the temporary changes to Darley Road, Leichhardt to enable access to and from the ancillary facility that would likely be required in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be decided by the contractor.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that:

'Temporary changes to Darley Road to enable access to and from the ancillary facility would likely be required. These may include changes to line marking to provide a temporary turning lane for construction traffic and temporary diversions to the pedestrian path on the northern side of Darley Road. These would be confirmed during detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor and in consideration of the safety and function of the road network, maintaining access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop and providing for continued pedestrian and cyclist movement.'

It is not clear how continued access, pedestrian and cyclist movement will be preserved and I am concerned that the impacts have not been correctly identified and assessed by the proponent.

I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I object to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor.

#### Light rail access

- I object to the EIS because it does not guarantee that the existing access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop would be maintained at all times. Fig 6-4 indicates that only the eastern access will be maintained. This greatly disadvantages the elderly and disabled who have to walk up a steep hill to the eastern access. If the proponent cannot guarantee access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop from the existing entry points or from points that are accessible to all then the Darley Road, Leichhardt construction site should be abandoned. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on users of the Light Rail.




Figure 6-4 Project Scoping - Map 2

**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:                                                                                                                                                           |                |           |  |
| Organisation:                                                                                                                                                   | <i>Private</i> |           |  |
| Address:                                                                                                                                                        | Suburb         | Post Code |  |
| Email:                                                                                                                                                          |                |           |  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website      Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |                |           |  |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                                            |                |           |  |

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 impacts

- I **object** to the EIS because the proponent has not provided details of the noise mitigation measures proposed in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. As a result it is not possible to assess the noise impacts of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. It is unacceptable for the proponent to establish a major construction site in the middle of a residential area without a clear plan for mitigating noise impacts.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) 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. In addition, temporary noise mitigation measures may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings, which would be provided to minimise noise impacts on surrounding properties.'

Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) will create a high level of noise impact for residents yet the proponent has not given details of the plan for mitigating this impact. The measures will be implemented only if 'reasonable and feasible' which is a subjective assessment as it does not state whether they will be assessed as reasonable from the standpoint of the proponent or the residents. What the proponent thinks is reasonable may not meet the residents expectation as to what is reasonable. The measures appear to be optional as the proponent only states that 'may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings'.

- I **object** to the EIS because the proponent has not provided a clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts from work within and outside of standard construction hours at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.
- I **object** to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the fact that the demolition of 7 Darley Road, Leichhardt will remove a significant noise barrier to traffic noise from the City West Link. This will mean increased traffic noise impacts to the residents of Darley Rd, Francis St, Hubert St and Charles St.
- I **object** to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of fully laden spoil haulage trucks exiting the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt driving up the very steep blind turn at the intersection with the City West Link. The RMS should install noise measuring equipment and monitoring cameras at this location to measure noise from heavy vehicles and identify vehicles whose noise exceeds the applicable Australian standard.
- I **object** to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of spoil haulage trucks using air brakes on the descent down Darley Rd off the City West Link. Heavy vehicle drivers should avoid using exhaust brakes, engine compression or 'jake' brakes near residential areas and noise-sensitive areas such as hospitals and schools, unless they are necessary for safety reasons. RMS should implement noise limits from engine compression brakes and should use roadside noise 'cameras' as an aid to enforcement at every location where WestConnex vehicles emitting engine compression brake noise might affect nearby communities.

**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:                                                                                                                                                     |                |           |  |
| Organisation:                                                                                                                                             | <i>Private</i> |           |  |
| Address:                                                                                                                                                  | Suburb         | Post Code |  |
| Email:                                                                                                                                                    |                |           |  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website      Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> |                |           |  |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                                                                      |                |           |  |

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


#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft noise and construction noise

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and the aircraft noise which the residents near the site already endure.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airservices Australia reports that in April to June 2017 the number of average daily noise events over 70 dBA. In Leichhardt this is an average of 16- 17 per hour over the peak morning period and 16 per hour in the early evening peak period.



I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel engine, exhaust and potentially air brake noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours.

**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:  |                |   |  |
| Organisation:  | <i>Private</i> |   |  |
| Address:   | Suburb         | Post Code                                 |  |
| Email:   |                |   |  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website |                | Yes / <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |  |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |                |   |  |

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

#### Hours of operation

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'Spoil handling associated with tunnelling supported by the Darley Road civil and tunnel site would occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Spoil would be handled below ground wherever practicable to reduce the potential for amenity impacts in adjacent areas. Spoil handling at the surface outside standard day time construction hours would occur within an acoustic shed to manage potential amenity impacts. Spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours, between 7.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'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. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS because the proponent/contractor would only have to keep local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would have no right to limit works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. As we have seen with other stages of WestConnex this leads to devastating impacts for residents who must endure significant periods of exposure to out of hours works which involve noise, lights and disturbance.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

**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:  |                |           |    |
| Organisation:  | <i>Private</i> |           |    |
| Address:   | Suburb         | Post Code |    |
| Email:   |                |           |    |
| 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.   |                |           |    |

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

#### **Non-compliance with SEARS**

**I object** to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

In so far as it describes the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt the EIS does not meet this requirement because it does not describe the components and activities that have been described to the community either in meetings with LAW (Leichhardt Against WestConnex) or at the WestConnex Community Reference Group established by Sydney Motorway Corporation.

The EIS has been released before the proponent is able to describe how it actually plans to carry out construction activities at Darley Road, Leichhardt, in particular the plan for staging the arrival of spoil trucks.

The proponent via its agent Sydney Motorway Corporation's employee Peter Jones has advised on several occasions that spoil haulage trucks will be staged from the Sydney Ports land on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. This is to avoid the situation at Haberfield where trucks circle the Northcote St site as they are not able to queue to enter it creating congestion and noise impacts as they drive slowly into Wattle St and Ramsay St. before making a second run at the Northcote St site from the Parramatta Road entrance.

No details of this staged spoil haulage proposal at Darley Road, Leichhardt are provided other than that 'construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt via the westbound lanes of City West Link'.

Peter Jones from Sydney Motorway Corporation has advised that he is in the process of finalising an agreement with Sydney Ports which will enable him to stage trucks from a location on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. The EIS should not have been released before this plan was finalised. Peter Jones has advised that he is only required to describe the 'worst case scenario' in the EIS, which is trucks arriving ad hoc via the eastbound lanes of City West Link. The EIS should describe what the proponent actually plans to do as well as the worst case scenario so that the impacts of all options being considered can be assessed and commented on.

It is not clear from the EIS how the alternative plan for the staged arrival of spoil trucks from Sydney Ports will be documented and how stakeholders will have an opportunity to assess its impacts. The EIS does not specifically state that this staged arrival plan will be documented in the CTAMP, the Ancillary Facilities Management Plan or the Preferred Infrastructure Report.

**I object** to the EIS on the grounds that it does not comply with the SEARS.

#### **Construction vehicle safety impacts**

**I object** to the EIS because the proposal in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt stated therein, that 'heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt' presents unacceptable safety and amenity impacts.

The corner of Darley Rd (actually James St) and the City West Link is a pedestrian zone for:

- Pupils of Orange Grove Public School who live in Leichhardt
- Students of Sydney Secondary College, Leichhardt Campus who alight at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Students of other schools along the light rail who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Commuters who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Residents walking to Leichhardt Park Aquatic Centre and adjacent sporting facilities
- Residents walking to the Orange Grove markets on Saturdays

The proponents plan brings pedestrians and school children in particular directly into the path of spoil haulage trucks at an intersection found to be the third most dangerous according to Transport for NSW figures.

A further impact will be to discourage people from walking in this area leading to greater car use for local trips.

**I object** to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the above grounds.

**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:   |                |           |  |
| Organisation:   | <i>Private</i> |           |  |
| Address:  | Suburb         | Post Code |  |
| Email:  |                |           |  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website      Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> |                |           |  |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |                |           |  |

**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 impacts

- The proponent has identified that the most affected receivers are residential receivers which adjoin the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on Darley Road between Norton Street and Falls Street. The most noise affected receivers are located between Charles Street and Norton Street due to their proximity to the construction site.

The proponent has identified that the worst case construction scenario will occur during

- Road adjustments works
- spoil handling works within the acoustic shed during all works periods

Highest construction noise impacts:

- Use of a rock breaker during the daytime period as part of the demolition works and
- Use of a road profiler during the night-time period as part of the road adjustment works

**I object** to the EIS because the proponent provides that spoil handling works within the acoustic shed will take place for the duration of the construction phase which could be up to two to three years' duration, yet there is no clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts.

- I object** to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the basis that there is no clear plan in the EIS for measures that will provide the maximum possible level of mitigation from noise impacts. I also object because there is no clear plan for remedies available to residents who are impacted.
- I object** to the EIS because the proponent's assessment of who are Highly Noise Affected receivers in the area adjacent to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt is incorrect and wrongly minimises the actual number of Highly Noise Affected receivers.
- Many residents in Charles St and Hubert St were highly affected by noise from works conducted during the renovation of 7 Darley Rd in 2016. In Hubert St, residents at least as far as No 31 and No 32 Hubert St were affected. The affected properties are not correctly reflected in the EIS.

**I object** to the EIS because it underestimates the number of residents that will be highly affected by noise. It does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site.

- I object** to the EIS because the proponent incorrectly asserts construction traffic is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in LAeq noise levels at receivers along the proposed construction traffic routes (Darley Road, Leichhardt and City West Link). This does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site. The impact of these will be substantial.


Commercial trucks are very loud; a standard diesel engine produces approximately 100 decibels (dB) of noise.

Engine braking noise can be disturbing both because it is loud and also as it has a distinctive characteristic modulation. Engine braking noise is caused by pulses of gases being emitted from the truck exhaust system, giving a 'machine gun' sound.

**I object** to the Darley Rd site because of the level of noise that the trucks will cause.

**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:  |        |           |  |
| Address:   | Suburb | Post Code |  |
| Signature:                                      |        |           |  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / No <input checked="" type="radio"/> |        |           |  |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |        |           |  |

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

#### Non-compliance with SEARS

- I object to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

Peter Jones from Sydney Motorway Corporation has advised that he is in the process of finalising an agreement with Sydney Ports which will enable him to stage trucks from a location on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. The EIS should not have been released before this plan was finalised. Peter Jones has advised that he is only required to describe the 'worst case scenario' in the EIS, which is trucks arriving ad hoc via the eastbound lanes of City West Link. The EIS should describe what the proponent actually plans to do as well as the worst case scenario so that the impacts of all options being considered can be assessed and commented on.

It is not clear from the EIS how the alternative plan for the staged arrival of spoil trucks from Sydney Ports will be documented and how stakeholders will have an opportunity to assess its impacts. The EIS does not specifically state that this staged arrival plan will be documented in the CTAMP, the Ancillary Facilities Management Plan or the Preferred Infrastructure Report.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it does not comply with the SEARS.

#### Truck routes


- I object to the EIS because it suggests that no local roads would be used by heavy vehicles during works yet at the same time acknowledges that spoil trucks may use local roads in exceptional circumstances which include when there is queuing to get into the site. Darley Rd is highly congested with traffic queues forming during much of the day which will lead to queues to enter the site. Queuing will not therefore be an exceptional circumstance and the result will be that spoil trucks are able to use local roads without being in breach, which will be often. This is unacceptable to residents of Francis, Hubert, William and Charles St and I object to the EIS on this basis. As queuing cannot be avoided on Darley Rd this clearly shows why this location is inappropriate. The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?

#### Noise impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of fully laden spoil haulage trucks exiting the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt driving up the very steep blind turn at the intersection with the City West Link. The RMS should install noise measuring equipment and monitoring cameras at this location to measure noise from heavy vehicles and identify vehicles whose noise that exceeds the applicable Australian standard.

**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:  |   |           |
| Address:   | Suburb  | Post Code |
| Signature:   |  |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |   |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |   |           |

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

#### Non-compliance with SEARS

I object to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

In so far as it describes the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt the EIS does not meet this requirement because it does not describe the components and activities that have been described to the community either in meetings with LAW (Leichhardt Against WestConnex) or at the WestConnex Community Reference Group established by Sydney Motorway Corporation.

The EIS has been released before the proponent is able to describe how it actually plans to carry out construction activities at Darley Road, Leichhardt, in particular the plan for staging the arrival of spoil trucks.

The proponent via its agent Sydney Motorway Corporation's employee Peter Jones has advised on several occasions that spoil haulage trucks will be staged from the Sydney Ports land on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. This is to avoid the situation at Haberfield where trucks circle the Northcote St site as they are not able to queue to enter it creating congestion and noise impacts as they drive slowly into Wattle St and Ramsay St. before making a second run at the Northcote St site from the Parramatta Road entrance.

No details of this staged spoil haulage proposal at Darley Road, Leichhardt are provided other than that 'construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt via the westbound lanes of City West Link'.

Peter Jones from Sydney Motorway Corporation has advised that he is in the process of finalising an agreement with Sydney Ports which will enable him to stage trucks from a location on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. The EIS should not have been released before this plan was finalised. Peter Jones has advised that he is only required to describe the 'worst case scenario' in the EIS, which is trucks arriving ad hoc via the eastbound lanes of City West Link. The EIS should describe what the proponent actually plans to do as well as the worst case scenario so that the impacts of all options being considered can be assessed and commented on.

It is not clear from the EIS how the alternative plan for the staged arrival of spoil trucks from Sydney Ports will be documented and how stakeholders will have an opportunity to assess its impacts. The EIS does not specifically state that this staged arrival plan will be documented in the CTAMP, the Ancillary Facilities Management Plan or the Preferred Infrastructure Report.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it does not comply with the SEARS.

#### Construction vehicle safety impacts

I object to the EIS because the proposal in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt stated therein, that 'heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt' presents unacceptable safety and amenity impacts.

The corner of Darley Rd (actually James St) and the City West Link is a pedestrian zone for:

- Pupils of Orange Grove Public School who live in Leichhardt
- Students of Sydney Secondary College, Leichhardt Campus who alight at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Students of other schools along the light rail who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Commuters who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Residents walking to Leichhardt Park Aquatic Centre and adjacent sporting facilities
- Residents walking to the Orange Grove markets on Saturdays

The proponents plan brings pedestrians and school children in particular directly into the path of spoil haulage trucks at an intersection found to be the third most dangerous according to Transport for NSW figures.

A further impact will be to discourage people from walking in this area leading to greater car use for local trips.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the above grounds.

**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:  |        |           |
| Address:   | Suburb | Post Code |
| Signature:   |        |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |        |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |        |           |

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


#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft noise and construction noise

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and the aircraft noise which the residents near the site already endure.


The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.

Airservices Australia reports that in April to June 2017 the number of average daily noise events over 70 dBA. In Leichhardt this is an average of 16-17 per hour over the peak morning period and 16 per hour in the early evening peak period.

I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel engine, exhaust and potentially air brake noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours.



Hourly distribution of noise events above 70dBA



**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:  | [REDACTED]  | [REDACTED] |                   |           |
| Address:   | [REDACTED]  | [REDACTED] | Suburb [REDACTED] | Post Code |
| Signature:   |  |            |                   |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> |   |            |                   |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |   |            |                   |           |

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 impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has not provided details of the noise mitigation measures proposed in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. As a result it is not possible to assess the noise impacts of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. It is unacceptable for the proponent to establish a major construction site in the middle of a residential area without a clear plan for mitigating noise impacts.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) 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. In addition, temporary noise mitigation measures may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings, which would be provided to minimise noise impacts on surrounding properties.'

Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) will create a high level of noise impact for residents yet the proponent has not given details of the plan for mitigating this impact. The measures will be implemented only if 'reasonable and feasible' which is a subjective assessment as it does not state whether they will be assessed as reasonable from the standpoint of the proponent or the residents. What the proponent thinks is reasonable may not meet the residents expectation as to what is reasonable. The measures appear to be optional as the proponent only states that that 'may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings'.

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the fact that the demolition of 7 Darley Road, Leichhardt will remove a significant noise barrier to traffic noise from the City West Link. This will mean increased traffic noise impacts to the residents of Darley Rd, Francis St, Hubert St and Charles St.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of fully laden spoil haulage trucks exiting the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt driving up the very steep blind turn at the intersection with the City West Link. The RMS should install noise measuring equipment and monitoring cameras at this location to measure noise from heavy vehicles and identify vehicles whose noise that exceeds the applicable Australian standard.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of spoil haulage trucks using air brakes on the descent down Darley Rd off the City West Link. Heavy vehicle drivers should avoid using exhaust brakes, engine compression or 'jake' brakes near residential areas and noise-sensitive areas such as hospitals and schools, unless they are necessary for safety reasons. RMS should implement noise limits from engine compression brakes and should use roadside noise 'cameras' as an aid to enforcement at every location where WestConnex vehicles emitting engine compression brake noise might affect nearby communities.

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has not provided a clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts from work within and outside of standard construction hours at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.

**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:  |        |           |
| Address:   | Suburb | Post Code |
| Signature:   |        |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |        |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |        |           |

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 impacts

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because engine noise from the trucks approaching the intersection up the grade would be a constant source of annoyance to residents of Darley Road down to its intersection with Charles Street.

The independent engineer engaged by the Inner West Council Jim Holt also came to this conclusion in his report to the Council. SMC have not recognised this impact in the EIS. They sent a response to the Council as follows:

**'Response:** Noise from construction traffic using the public road network is assessed under the Roads and Maritime Noise Criteria Guideline (NCG), which documents Roads and Maritime's approach to implementing the Road Noise Policy (RNP). Under the NCG, an initial screening test is carried out to determine whether noise levels would increase by more than two decibels (dBA). This represents an increase in the number of vehicles of approximately 60 per cent due to construction traffic or a temporary reroute due to a road closure. Where increases are 2dBA or less, then further assessment is required as noise level changes would most likely not be perceptible to most people. Where noise levels increase by more than 2dBA (i.e. 2.1 dBA or greater) further assessment is required using criteria presented in the NCG.

Darley Road is currently being used by heavy vehicles and light commercial vehicles (construction, delivery etc) that contribute to background noises. The predicted traffic noise increase (dBA) at the Darley Road site is around 0.5dBA.'

You do not need to be an acoustic engineer to know that truck and dogs are very noisy and that local residents will be impacted greatly, especially those close to where trucks will be accelerating and decelerating. Darley Road, Leichhardt is not currently experiencing 14 truck and dog movements an hour during peak time stated in the EIS and an unknown (but presumably greater) number of truck movements within off peak construction hours. This is a truck movement every 3-4 minutes during peak. Assuming that they will increase truck movements during off peak residents can expect a truck every 2-3 minutes. We do not need a screening test or assessment to tell us that residents will be subjected to extreme levels of truck noise.

SMC's response does not acknowledge this and does not refute Jim Holt's conclusion that residents will be impacted. SMC's response like the proponent's EIS fails to acknowledge the true impact of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.

The resident's of Darley Rd, Francis, Hubert and Charles St have little acoustic protection against the noise of truck engines, exhaust and brakes and non is contemplated in the EIS.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because the truck noise impacts for residents will be too great for the extended period of construction involved and the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt should be rejected on this basis.

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:  |           |   |
| Address:   | Suburb  | Post Code  |
| Signature:   |           |   |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |  |   |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |  |   |

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 impacts

- The proponent has identified that the most affected receivers are residential receivers which adjoin the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on Darley Road between Norton Street and Falls Street. The most noise affected receivers are located between Charles Street and Norton Street due to their proximity to the construction site.

The proponent has identified that the worst case construction scenario will occur during

- Road adjustments works
- spoil handling works within the acoustic shed during all works periods

Highest construction noise impacts:

- Use of a rock breaker during the daytime period as part of the demolition works and
- Use of a road profiler during the night-time period as part of the road adjustment works

I object to the EIS because the proponent provides that spoil handling works within the acoustic shed will take place for the duration of the construction phase which could be up to two to three years' duration, yet there is no clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts.

- I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the basis that there is no clear plan in the EIS for measures that will provide the maximum possible level of mitigation from noise impacts. I also object because there is no clear plan for remedies available to residents who are impacted.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent's assessment of who are Highly Noise Affected receivers in the area adjacent to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt is incorrect and wrongly minimises the actual number of Highly Noise Affected receivers.

- Many residents in Charles St and Hubert St were highly affected by noise from works conducted during the renovation of 7 Darley Rd in 2016. In Hubert St, residents at least as far as No 31 and No 32 Hubert St were affected. The affected properties are not correctly reflected in the EIS.

I object to the EIS because it underestimates the number of residents that will be highly affected by noise. It does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site.

- I object to the EIS because the proponent incorrectly asserts construction traffic is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in LAeq noise levels at receivers along the proposed construction traffic routes (Darley Road, Leichhardt and City West Link). This does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site. The impact of these will be substantial.

Commercial trucks are very loud; a standard diesel engine produces approximately 100 decibels (dB) of noise.

Engine braking noise can be disturbing both because it is loud and also as it has a distinctive characteristic modulation. Engine braking noise is caused by pulses of gases being emitted from the truck exhaust system, giving a 'machine gun' sound.

I object to the Darley Rd site because of the level of noise that the trucks will cause.

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:  |        |           |
| Address:   | Suburb | Post Code |
| Signature:   |        |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> |        |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |        |           |

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

#### Hours of operation

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'Spoil handling associated with tunnelling supported by the Darley Road civil and tunnel site would occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Spoil would be handled below ground wherever practicable to reduce the potential for amenity impacts in adjacent areas. Spoil handling at the surface outside standard day time construction hours would occur within an acoustic shed to manage potential amenity impacts. Spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours, between 7.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours. The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'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. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS because the proponent/contractor would only have to keep local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would have no right to limit works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. As we have seen with other stages of WestConnex this leads to devastating impacts for residents who must endure significant periods of exposure to out of hours works which involve noise, lights and disturbance.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

**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:  | [REDACTED] |                   |
| Address:   | [REDACTED] | Suburb [REDACTED] |
| Post Code  | [REDACTED] |                   |
| Signature:   | [REDACTED] |                   |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |            |                   |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |            |                   |

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

**Cumulative impacts of aircraft emissions and spoil truck emissions**

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of emissions from spoil truck vehicles from it proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and emissions from aircraft to which residents near the site are already exposed.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airplane exhaust, like car exhaust, contains a variety of air pollutants, including sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Many of these particles of pollution are tiny, about a hundred millionths of an inch wide, or smaller than the width of a human hair. So-called particulate matter that's especially small is the main culprit in human health effects, especially since the particulates can become wedged deep in the lung and possibly enter the bloodstream, scientists say.

Exposure to loud noise from living under a flight path over a long period of time may increase the risk of developing high blood pressure or having a stroke, a 2013 study by researchers at the University of Athens suggests.

Researchers examined data from 420 people living near busy Athens International Airport in Greece and found living with high noise levels from aircraft, especially at night, was associated with high blood pressure.

Every additional 10 decibels of night-time aircraft noise appeared to result in a 69 per cent increased risk of high blood pressure, also known as hypertension.

The researchers at the University of Athens found that around half the participants (just under 45 per cent) were exposed to more than 55 decibels of daytime aircraft noise, while around one in four (just over 27 per cent) were exposed to more than 45 decibels of night-time aircraft noise.

Only around one in 10 (11 per cent) were exposed to significant road traffic noise of more than 55 decibels.

Between 2004-6 and 2013, 71 people were newly diagnosed with high blood pressure and 44 were diagnosed with heart flutter (cardiac arrhythmia), while a further 18 had a heart attack, the researchers found.

I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because in addition to the existing aircraft emissions and noise experienced by people living near the site, this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel exhaust emissions and noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours. This will give rise to increased health risks from noise and air pollution which research suggest will cause increased blood pressure and risk of stroke.

**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:   |        |           |
| Address:  | Suburb | Post Code |
| Signature:  |        |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |        |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |        |           |

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

#### Hours of operation

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'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. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

#### Noise impacts

- The resident's of Darley Rd, Francis, Hubert and Charles St have little acoustic protection against the noise of truck engines, exhaust and brakes and none is contemplated in the EIS.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because the truck noise impacts for residents will be too great for the extended period of construction involved and the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt should be rejected on this basis.

**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:   |  |        |           |
| Address:  |  | Suburb | Post Code |
| Signature:  |  |        |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |  |        |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |  |        |           |

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 impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent incorrectly asserts construction traffic is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in LAeq noise levels at receivers along the proposed construction traffic routes (Darley Road, Leichhardt and City West Link). This does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site. The impact of these will be substantial.

Commercial trucks are very loud; a standard diesel engine produces approximately 100 decibels (dB) of noise.

Engine braking noise can be disturbing both because it is loud and also as it has a distinctive characteristic modulation. Engine braking noise is caused by pulses of gases being emitted from the truck exhaust system, giving a 'machine gun' sound.

I object to the Darley Rd site because of the level of noise that the trucks will cause.

#### Truck routes

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be detailed in the CTAMP, Preferred Infrastructure Report or Ancillary Facilities Management Plan.  
Peter Jones of SMC has on many occasions made representations to the community that his plan is to stage trucks from the port and eventually when possible to have them arrive and depart from the site underground when a tunnel is established between Leichhardt and the M4 East. He has also said that loading of spoil would take place underground at this time. He has recently told us of his plan to load trucks from a ramp off the city west link by means of a hopper conveyor which would pass over the Light rail station delivering spoil into silos below which trucks would pull up to receive their load. The laden trucks would then travel west bound along the city west link. None of this plan is detailed in the EIS.  
I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I object to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into the CTAMP, PIR or AFMP on matters which will have a devastating impact to me and to residents near 7 Darley Rd.

**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:  |  |        |           |
| Address:   |  | Suburb | Post Code |
| Signature:   |  |        |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |  |        |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |  |        |           |

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

#### **Construction vehicle safety impacts**

I object to the EIS because the proposal in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt stated therein, that 'heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt' presents unacceptable safety and amenity impacts.

The corner of Darley Rd (actually James St) and the City West Link is a pedestrian zone for:

- Pupils of Orange Grove Public School who live in Leichhardt
- Students of Sydney Secondary College, Leichhardt Campus who alight at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Students of other schools along the light rail who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Commuters who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Residents walking to Leichhardt Park Aquatic Centre and adjacent sporting facilities
- Residents walking to the Orange Grove markets on Saturdays

The proponents plan brings pedestrians and school children in particular directly into the path of spoil haulage trucks at an intersection found to be the third most dangerous according to Transport for NSW figures.

A further impact will be to discourage people from walking in this area leading to greater car use for local trips.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the above grounds.

#### **Noise impacts**

I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the fact that the demolition of 7 Darley Road, Leichhardt will remove a significant noise barrier to traffic noise from the City West Link. This will mean increased traffic noise impacts to the residents of Darley Rd, Francis St, Hubert St and Charles St.

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:   |        |           |
| Address:  | Suburb | Post Code |
| Signature:  |        |           |
| 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.            |        |           |

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

#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft emissions and spoil truck emissions

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of emissions from spoil truck vehicles from it proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and emissions from aircraft to which residents near the site are already exposed.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airplane exhaust, like car exhaust, contains a variety of air pollutants, including sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Many of these particles of pollution are tiny, about a hundred millionths of an inch wide, or smaller than the width of a human hair. So-called particulate matter that's especially small is the main culprit in human health effects, especially since the particulates can become wedged deep in the lung and possibly enter the bloodstream, scientists say.

Exposure to loud noise from living under a flight path over a long period of time may increase the risk of developing high blood pressure or having a stroke, a 2013 study by researchers at the University of Athens suggests.

Researchers examined data from 420 people living near busy Athens International Airport in Greece and found living with high noise levels from aircraft, especially at night, was associated with high blood pressure.

Every additional 10 decibels of night-time aircraft noise appeared to result in a 69 per cent increased risk of high blood pressure, also known as hypertension.

The researchers at the University of Athens found that around half the participants (just under 45 per cent) were exposed to more than 55 decibels of daytime aircraft noise, while around one in four (just over 27 per cent) were exposed to more than 45 decibels of night-time aircraft noise.

Only around one in 10 (11 per cent) were exposed to significant road traffic noise of more than 55 decibels.

Between 2004-6 and 2013, 71 people were newly diagnosed with high blood pressure and 44 were diagnosed with heart flutter (cardiac arrhythmia), while a further 18 had a heart attack, the researchers found.

I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because in addition to the existing aircraft emissions and noise experienced by people living near the site, this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel exhaust emissions and noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours. This will give rise to increased health risks from noise and air pollution which research suggest will cause increased blood pressure and risk of stroke.

**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:  | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]        | [REDACTED]           |
| Address:   | [REDACTED] | Suburb [REDACTED] | Post Code [REDACTED] |
| Signature:   | [REDACTED] |                   |                      |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |            |                   |                      |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |            |                   |                      |

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


**Cumulative impacts of aircraft noise and construction noise**

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and the aircraft noise which the residents near the site already endure.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.




Airservices Australia reports that in April to June 2017 the number of average daily noise events over 70 dBA. In Leichhardt this is an average of 16- 17 per hour over the peak morning period and 16 per hour in the early evening peak period.



I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel engine, exhaust and potentially air brake noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours.

**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:   |   |        |           |
| Address:  |  | Suburb | Post Code |
| Signature:  |  |        |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes / No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |  |        |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |  |        |           |

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

#### Pedestrian and cyclist movements

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the temporary changes to Darley Road, Leichhardt to enable access to and from the ancillary facility that would likely be required in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be decided by the contractor.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that:

'Temporary changes to Darley Road to enable access to and from the ancillary facility would likely be required. These may include changes to line marking to provide a temporary turning lane for construction traffic and temporary diversions to the pedestrian path on the northern side of Darley Road. These would be confirmed during detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor and in consideration of the safety and function of the road network, maintaining access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop and providing for continued pedestrian and cyclist movement.'


It is not clear how continued access, pedestrian and cyclist movement will be preserved and I am concerned that the impacts have not been correctly identified and

assessed by the proponent.

I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I object to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor.

#### Light rail access

- I object to the EIS because it does not guarantee that the existing access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop would be maintained at all times. Fig 6-4 indicates that only the eastern access will be maintained. This greatly disadvantages the elderly and disabled who have to walk up a steep hill to the eastern access. If the proponent cannot guarantee access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop from the existing entry points or from points that are accessible to all then the Darley Road, Leichhardt construction site should be abandoned. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on users of the Light Rail.



**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:  |        |           |
| Address:   | Suburb | Post Code |
| Signature:   |        |           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |        |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |        |           |

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

#### Truck routes

- I object to the EIS because it suggests that no local roads would be used by heavy vehicles during works yet at the same time acknowledges that spoil trucks may use local roads in exceptional circumstances which include when there is queuing to get into the site. Darley Rd is highly congested with traffic queues forming during much of the day which will lead to queues to enter the site. Queuing will not therefore be an exceptional circumstance and the result will be that spoil trucks are able to use local roads without being in breach, which will be often. This is unacceptable to residents of Francis, Hubert, William and Charles St and I object to the EIS on this basis. As queuing cannot be avoided on Darley Rd this clearly shows why this location is inappropriate. The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?
- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site, which SMC have on many occasions told the community they are contemplating as alternatives.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that 'It is anticipated that the majority of construction traffic would enter the site from the southern (westbound) carriageway of Darley Road, Leichhardt via new driveways. Heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt. A temporary right turning lane at the intersection of City West Link and Darley Road, Leichhardt would be provided for use by construction vehicles. Heavy vehicles would exit the site by turning left onto Darley Road, Leichhardt before turning left onto City West Link.'

'Construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) via the westbound lanes of City West Link.'

'Temporary traffic management measures would be established to enable access and egress arrangements. These would be detailed in a CTAMP, which would be prepared to manage construction traffic associated with the project.'

I object to the proposal for vehicles associated with spoil haulage to travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Rd. This proposal is dangerous

and the impacts and risks are too great. Darley Rd is acknowledged by RMS to be a sub-standard road in terms of its construction. The intersection from the city west link is a steep blind turn even for traffic coming across from James St. This is followed by immediate left hand turns into both Francis St and Hubert St. A number of properties on Darley Rd would be at risk of destruction from spoil haulage trucks in the event of a truck having to brake suddenly to avoid stationary vehicles.

The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be detailed in the CTAMP, Preferred Infrastructure Report or Ancillary Facilities Management Plan.

Peter Jones of SMC has on many occasions made representations to the community that his plan is to stage trucks from the port and eventually when possible to have them arrive and depart from the site underground when a tunnel is established between Leichhardt and the M4 East. He has also said that loading of spoil would take place underground at this time. He has recently told us of his plan to load trucks from a ramp off the city west link by means of a hopper conveyor which would pass over the Light rail station delivering spoil into silos below which trucks would pull up to receive their load. The laden trucks would then travel west bound along the city west link. None of this plan is detailed in the EIS.

I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I object to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into the CTAMP, PIR or AFMP on matters which will have a devastating impact to me and to residents near 7 Darley Rd.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>PO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Marlee Bower</u>                        |
|  | Address: <u>27 Knight St</u>                     |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>Erskineville</u> Postcode <u>2043</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <u>M. Bower</u>                       |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <i>Marlee Bone</i>                         |
|   | Address: <i>25 Knight St</i>                     |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>Erskineville</i> Postcode <i>2043</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link  | Signature: <i>M. Bone</i>                        |
| Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br><b>Declaration :</b> 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Marlee Power</u>                         |
|   | Address: <u>27 Knight Street<br/>ERSKINEVILLE</u> |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>+</u> Postcode <u>2043</u>             |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link  | Signature: <u>M. Power</u>                        |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br><b>Declaration : I HAVE NOT</b> 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: <u>Marlee Bowes</u>                        |
|   | Address: <u>27 Knight St</u>                     |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>Erskineville</u> Postcode <u>2043</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <u>M Bowes</u>                        |
| Please INCLUDE my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Marlee Bower</i>                        |
|  | Address: <i>27 Knight St</i>                     |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>Erskineville</i> Postcode <i>2043</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>M Bower</i>                        |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 (following 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Marlee Bowen</i>  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Address: <i>27 Knight St</i>   |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Suburb: <i>Erskineville</i> Postcode <i>2043</i><br>Signature: <i>M. Bowen</i> |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 be 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Marlee Bowe</i>                        |
|  | Address: <i>27 Knight St</i>                    |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>Eskineville</i> Postcode <i>2043</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>M. Bowe</i>                       |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 \_\_\_\_\_

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Submission from:  | Submission to:  |
| Name: .....<br>  | Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 |
| Signature: .....  | Attn: Director – Transport Assessments  |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>Declaration : I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.<br>Address: .....<br>Suburb: Lane Cove Postcode. 2066 | Application Number: SSI 7485 Application<br>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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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)

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: <b>BRIAN FREEMAN</b>  |
|   | Address: <b>278 ANNANDALE ST</b>  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <b>ANNANDALE</b> Postcode <b>2038</b>   |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature:  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 has many caveats and depends upon further steps (such as traffic management plans), the detail of which is not provided. The community has no certainty that any of the impacts from construction will be managed to an acceptable level.
3. 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.
4. 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)
5. 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)
6. There are 36 homes identified as having severe noise impacts during construction in Leichhardt and Lilyfield. No noise barriers have been identified so residents are unable to comment as to whether this impact will be reduced. No proposal for alternative accommodation is provided. This is unacceptable and all of the proposed noise mitigation options should be detailed in the EIS so that residents have an opportunity to comment on what is proposed. (Executive Summary xvii)
7. There is no plan to manage traffic on Darley Road proposed in the EIS. This critical arterial road is regularly congested at peak periods. Reference in the EIS to developing a traffic management plan in the future is not acceptable. The detail of what is proposed needs to be contained in the EIS so that residents can assess whether the impact of 170 light and heavy vehicle movements a day in and out of the site can be acceptably managed.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>BRIAN FREEMAN</i>                    |
|  | Address: <i>278 ANNANDALE ST</i>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>ANNANDALE</i> Postcode <i>2038</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>B Freeman</i>                   |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. 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. The EIS does not mention that 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>BRIAN FREEMAN</u>                    |
|  | Address: <u>278 ANNANDALE ST</u>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>ANNANDALE</u> Postcode <u>2038</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <u>B Freeman</u>                   |
| <p>Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p>Declaration : I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |   |

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 proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. I object 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.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically provide that all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
4. 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.
5. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed or any detail provided. 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 uninhabitable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
6. The EIS does not even 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: <i>BRIAN FREEMAN</i>                    |
|   | Address: <i>278 ANNANDALE ST</i>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>ANNANDALE</i> Postcode <i>2038</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>B Freeman</i>                   |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>BRIAN FREEMAN</u>                    |
|   | Address: <u>278 ANNANDALE ST</u>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>ANNANDALE</u> Postcode <u>2038</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <u>Brian</u>                       |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 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.
3. The impacts in the EIS are misleading because they do not include any detail of the cumulative impact caused by the overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 (of up to one year). 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 multiple WestConnex projects. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure. Nor does the EIS provide for any traffic management to prevent rat running during the period of construction, when Stages 1 and 2 have opened. The EIS should not be approved without this detail and adequate plans to manage this impact.
4. 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)
5. The EIS states that all vegetation on the Darley Road site will be removed. This includes a mature large tree which provides a visual and noise barrier from the City West Link. The tree should not be permitted to be removed.
6. Despite the fact the EIS identifies over 30 homes with severe noise impacts, no mitigation is mandated. While the possibility of noise walls is flagged, along with in-home treatments, none of this is a requirement. Nor is any detail provided on which residents or business owners can comment. 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <i>BRIAN FREEMAN</i>                    |
|   | Address: <i>278 ANNANDALE ST</i>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>ANNANDALE</i> Postcode <i>2038</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>B Freeman</i>                   |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. The period of construction proposed is unacceptably long. Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years while the EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This period creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.
3. 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. The EIS states 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.
4. No truck movements should be permitted on Darley Rd or any local roads in Leichhardt or adjoining suburbs. 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 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. I object to the selection of the Darley Rd site altogether, but propose this alternative, which appears to represent the least worst impact, should be chosen if this site is to be used.
5. I object to the number of truck movements proposed at the Darley Road site. The EIS states that there will be 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, as is currently provided.
6. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets and provide a plan for enforcement (to be paid for by SMC and not by the Inner West Council).

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>BRIAN FREEMAN</u>                    |
|   | Address: <u>278 ANNANDALE ST</u>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>ANNANDALE</u> Postcode <u>2038</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <u>B Freeman</u>                   |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

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 as it will create unacceptable noise impacts for the community and lead to traffic chaos, along with creating an increased risk of accidents to pedestrians and cycle users.
2. The substation and water treatment plant proposed for Darley Road should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link so that it is less visible to residents. 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. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the acknowledged constraints of the Darley Rd 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, as pertains to the Darley Road site, needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.
4. At the conclusion of the construction period, the Darley Road 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 approval conditions need to mandate that the Darley Rd site is to be preserved as green space or other community purposes at the conclusion of the construction period.
5. No trucks (heavy or light) should be permitted on any streets adjacent to Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street). A blanket prohibition should be in force with respect to any worker vehicles from the construction site parking on these local streets. These homes will already suffer the worst construction impacts and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and the additional noise impacts of additional cars on their street. These local streets are not designed to handle heavy vehicle movements. Therefore, any approval conditions need to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all local streets adjacent to Darley Road.
6. Any approval conditions and the relevant construction contracts must require that all workers to the Darley Rd site are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail, with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads adjacent to the Darley Road site. The site currently provides only 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.

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Helen France</u>                      |
|   | Address: <u>48 Charles St</u>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <u>Helen France</u>                 |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

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 as it will create unacceptable noise impacts for the community and lead to traffic chaos, along with creating an increased risk of accidents to pedestrians and cycle users.
2. The substation and water treatment plant proposed for Darley Road should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link so that it is less visible to residents. 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. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the acknowledged constraints of the Darley Rd 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, as pertains to the Darley Road site, needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.
4. At the conclusion of the construction period, the Darley Road 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 approval conditions need to mandate that the Darley Rd site is to be preserved as green space or other community purposes at the conclusion of the construction period.
5. No trucks (heavy or light) should be permitted on any streets adjacent to Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street). A blanket prohibition should be in force with respect to any worker vehicles from the construction site parking on these local streets. These homes will already suffer the worst construction impacts and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and the additional noise impacts of additional cars on their street. These local streets are not designed to handle heavy vehicle movements. Therefore, any approval conditions need to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all local streets adjacent to Darley Road.
6. Any approval conditions and the relevant construction contracts must require that all workers to the Darley Rd site are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail, with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads adjacent to the Darley Road site. The site currently provides only 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.

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Helen Trace</u>  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Address: <u>48 Charles Street</u>   |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2045</u><br>Signature: <u>Helen</u> |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Helen France</u>                      |
|  | Address: <u>48 Charles Street</u>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <u>Helen France</u>                 |
| <p>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p>Declaration : I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |  |

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 proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. I object 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.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically provide that all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
4. 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.
5. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed or any detail provided. 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 uninhabitable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
6. The EIS does not even 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Helen France</u>   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Address: <u>48 Charles Street</u>   |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u><br>Signature: <u>Helen</u> |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 be 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: <i>Helen Franco</i>                      |
|   | Address: <i>48 Charles Street</i>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>Helen</i>                        |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. 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. The EIS does not mention that 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Helen France</u>                      |
|  | Address: <u>48 Charles Street</u>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2045</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <u>Helen</u>                        |
| <p>Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration :</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |  |

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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Helen France</u>     |                      |
|  | Address: <u>48 Charles St</u> |                      |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u>     | Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <u>Helen</u>       |                      |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 (following 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

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

|  |                             |                          |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name:  | <i>Helen France</i>         |                          |
| Organisation:  |                             |                          |
| Address:   | <i>48 Charters St</i>       | Suburb <i>Leichhardt</i> |
| Post Code  | <i>2040</i>                 |                          |
| Email:   | <i>hrfrance@hotmail.com</i> |                          |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / <input type="checkbox"/> No |                             |                          |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |                             |                          |

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

#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft emissions and spoil truck emissions

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of emissions from spoil truck vehicles from its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and emissions from aircraft to which residents near the site are already exposed.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airplane exhaust, like car exhaust, contains a variety of air pollutants, including sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Many of these particles of pollution are tiny, about a hundred millionths of an inch wide, or smaller than the width of a human hair. So-called particulate matter that's especially small is the main culprit in human health effects, especially since the particulates can become wedged deep in the lung and possibly enter the bloodstream, scientists say.

Exposure to loud noise from living under a flight path over a long period of time may increase the risk of developing high blood pressure or having a stroke, a 2013 study by researchers at the University of Athens suggests.

Researchers examined data from 420 people living near busy Athens International Airport in Greece and found living with high noise levels from aircraft, especially at night, was associated with high blood pressure.

Every additional 10 decibels of night-time aircraft noise appeared to result in a 69 per cent increased risk of high blood pressure, also known as hypertension.

The researchers at the University of Athens found that around half the participants (just under 45 per cent) were exposed to more than 55 decibels of daytime aircraft noise, while around one in four (just over 27 per cent) were exposed to more than 45 decibels of night-time aircraft noise.

Only around one in 10 (11 per cent) were exposed to significant road traffic noise of more than 55 decibels.

Between 2004-6 and 2013, 71 people were newly diagnosed with high blood pressure and 44 were diagnosed with heart flutter (cardiac arrhythmia), while a further 18 had a heart attack, the researchers found.

I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because in addition to the existing aircraft emissions and noise experienced by people living near the site, this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel exhaust emissions and noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours. This will give rise to increased health risks from noise and air pollution which research suggest will cause increased blood pressure and risk of stroke.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Helen France</u>                      |
|  | Address: <u>48 Charles St</u>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <u>Helen</u>                        |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 has many caveats and depends upon further steps (such as traffic management plans), the detail of which is not provided. The community has no certainty that any of the impacts from construction will be managed to an acceptable level.
3. 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.
4. 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)
5. 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)
6. There are 36 homes identified as having severe noise impacts during construction in Leichhardt and Lilyfield. No noise barriers have been identified so residents are unable to comment as to whether this impact will be reduced. No proposal for alternative accommodation is provided. This is unacceptable and all of the proposed noise mitigation options should be detailed in the EIS so that residents have an opportunity to comment on what is proposed. (Executive Summary xvii)
7. There is no plan to manage traffic on Darley Road proposed in the EIS. This critical arterial road is regularly congested at peak periods. Reference in the EIS to developing a traffic management plan in the future is not acceptable. The detail of what is proposed needs to be contained in the EIS so that residents can assess whether the impact of 170 light and heavy vehicle movements a day in and out of the site can be acceptably managed.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Helen France</u>                      |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Address: <u>48 Charles Street</u>              |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link  | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Helen France</u>                      |
|  | Address: <u>48 Charles Street</u>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link   | Signature: <u>Helen</u>                        |
| <p>Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration :</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |  |

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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: <i>Helen France</i>                      |
|   | Address: <i>48 Charles Street</i>              |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>Helen</i>                        |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. The period of construction proposed is unacceptably long. Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years while the EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This period creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.
3. 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. The EIS states 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.
4. No truck movements should be permitted on Darley Rd or any local roads in Leichhardt or adjoining suburbs. 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 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. I object to the selection of the Darley Rd site altogether, but propose this alternative, which appears to represent the least worst impact, should be chosen if this site is to be used.
5. I object to the number of truck movements proposed at the Darley Road site. The EIS states that there will be 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, as is currently provided.
6. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets and provide a plan for enforcement (to be paid for by my SMC and not by the Inner West Council).

---

**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:   | Helen France                      |                |
| Organisation:   |                                   |                |
| Address:  | 48 Charles St-1 Suburb Leichhardt | Post Code 2040 |
| Email:  | hrfrance@hotmail.com              |                |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No |                                   |                |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |                                   |                |

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

#### Hours of operation

- I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

#### Truck routes

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site, which SMC have on many occasions told the community they are contemplating as alternatives.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that 'It is anticipated that the majority of construction traffic would enter the site from the southern (westbound) carriageway of Darley Road, Leichhardt via new driveways. Heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt. A temporary right turning lane at the intersection of City West Link and Darley Road, Leichhardt would be provided for use by construction vehicles. Heavy vehicles would exit the site by turning left onto Darley Road, Leichhardt before turning left onto City West Link.'

'Construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) via the westbound lanes of City West Link.'

'Temporary traffic management measures would be established to enable access and egress arrangements. These would be detailed in a CTAMP, which would be prepared to manage construction traffic associated with the project.'

I object to the proposal for vehicles associated with spoil haulage to travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Rd. This proposal is dangerous and the impacts and risks are too great. Darley Rd is acknowledged by RMS to be a sub-standard road in terms of its construction. The intersection from the city west link is a steep blind turn even for traffic coming across from James St. This is followed by immediate left hand turns into both Francis St and Hubert St. A number of properties on Darley Rd would be at risk of destruction from spoil haulage trucks in the event of a truck having to brake suddenly to avoid stationary vehicles.

The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should resident's lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?

**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:  | Helen Franco         |        |                           |
| Organisation:  |                      |        |                           |
| Address:   | 48 Charles St        | Suburb | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:   | hrfranco@hotmail.com |        |                           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / <input type="checkbox"/> No |                      |        |                           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |                      |        |                           |

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 impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has not provided a clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts from work within and outside of standard construction hours at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.

#### Non-compliance with SEARS

- I object to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

The proponent via its agent Sydney Motorway Corporation's employee Peter Jones has advised on several occasions that spoil haulage trucks will be staged from the Sydney Ports land on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. This is to avoid the situation at Haberfield where trucks circle the Northcote St site as they are not able to queue to enter it creating congestion and noise impacts as they drive slowly into Wattle St and Ramsay St. before making a second run at the Northcote St site from the Parramatta Road entrance.

No details of this staged spoil haulage proposal at Darley Road, Leichhardt are provided other than that 'construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt via the westbound lanes of City West Link'.

#### Noise impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of spoil haulage trucks using air brakes on the descent down Darley Rd off the City West Link. Heavy vehicle drivers should avoid using exhaust brakes, engine compression or 'jake' brakes near residential areas and noise-sensitive areas such as hospitals and schools, unless they are necessary for safety reasons. RMS should implement noise limits from engine compression brakes and should use roadside noise 'cameras' as an aid to enforcement at every location where WestConnex vehicles emitting engine compression brake noise might affect nearby communities.

#### Noise impacts

- I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the basis that there is no clear plan in the EIS for measures that will provide the maximum possible level of mitigation from noise impacts. I also object because there is no clear plan for remedies available to residents who are impacted.

**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:  |        |           |  |
| Organisation:  |        |           |  |
| Address:   | Suburb | Post Code |  |
| Email:   |        |           |  |
| 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.                 |        |           |  |

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

#### **Construction vehicle safety impacts**

**I object** to the EIS because the proposal in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt stated therein, that 'heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt' presents unacceptable safety and amenity impacts.

The corner of Darley Rd (actually James St) and the City West Link is a pedestrian zone for:

- Pupils of Orange Grove Public School who live in Leichhardt
- Students of Sydney Secondary College, Leichhardt Campus who alight at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Students of other schools along the light rail who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Commuters who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Residents walking to Leichhardt Park Aquatic Centre and adjacent sporting facilities
- Residents walking to the Orange Grove markets on Saturdays

The proponents plan brings pedestrians and school children in particular directly into the path of spoil haulage trucks at an intersection found to be the third most dangerous according to Transport for NSW figures.

A further impact will be to discourage people from walking in this area leading to greater car use for local trips.

**I object** to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the above grounds.

#### **Noise impacts**

**I object** to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the fact that the demolition of 7 Darley Road, Leichhardt will remove a significant noise barrier to traffic noise from the City West Link. This will mean increased traffic noise impacts to the residents of Darley Rd, Francis St, Hubert St and Charles St.

**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:  | [REDACTED] |        |            |
| Organisation:  | [REDACTED] |        |            |
| Address:   | [REDACTED] | Suburb | [REDACTED] |
| Email:   | [REDACTED] |        |            |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / <input type="radio"/> No |            |        |            |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |            |        |            |

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

#### **Hours of operation**

**I object** to the EIS because the proponent/contractor would only have to keep local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would have no right to limit works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. As we have seen with other stages of WestConnex this leads to devastating impacts for residents who must endure significant periods of exposure to out of hours works which involve noise, lights and disturbance.

#### **Non-compliance with SEARS**

**I object** to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

In so far as it describes the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt the EIS does not meet this requirement because it does not describe the components and activities that have been described to the community either in meetings with LAW (Leichhardt Against WestConnex) or at the WestConnex Community Reference Group established by Sydney Motorway Corporation.

**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:  | Helen France         |          |                           |
| Organisation:  |                      |          |                           |
| Address:   | 48 Charles St        | Suburb   | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:   | hrfrance@hotmail.com |          |                           |
| 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.   |                      |          |                           |

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 impacts

- Many residents in Charles St and Hubert St were highly affected by noise from works conducted during the renovation of 7 Darley Rd in 2016. In Hubert St, residents at least as far as No 31 and No 32 Hubert St were affected. The affected properties are not correctly reflected in the EIS.
- I **object** to the EIS because it underestimates the number of residents that will be highly affected by noise. It does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site.

#### Pedestrian and cyclist movements

- I **object** to the EIS because it fails to describe the temporary changes to Darley Road, Leichhardt to enable access to and from the ancillary facility that would likely be required in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be decided by the contractor.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that:

'Temporary changes to Darley Road to enable access to and from the ancillary facility would likely be required. These may include changes to line marking to provide a temporary turning lane for construction traffic and temporary diversions to the pedestrian path on the northern side of Darley Road. These would be confirmed during detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor and in consideration of the safety and function of the road network, maintaining access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop and providing for continued pedestrian and cyclist movement.'

It is not clear how continued access, pedestrian and cyclist movement will be preserved and I am concerned that the impacts have not been correctly identified and assessed by the proponent.

I **object** to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I **object** to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor.

**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:   | Helen France         |        |                           |
| Organisation:   |                      |        |                           |
| Address:  | 48 Charles St        | Suburb | Leichhardt Post Code 2045 |
| Email:  | hrfrance@hotmail.com |        |                           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No |                      |        |                           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |                      |        |                           |

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

#### Non-compliance with SEARS

- I object to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

Peter Jones from Sydney Motorway Corporation has advised that he is in the process of finalising an agreement with Sydney Ports which will enable him to stage trucks from a location on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. The EIS should not have been released before this plan was finalised. Peter Jones has advised that he is only required to describe the 'worst case scenario' in the EIS, which is trucks arriving ad hoc via the eastbound lanes of City West Link. The EIS should describe what the proponent actually plans to do as well as the worst case scenario so that the impacts of all options being considered can be assessed and commented on.

It is not clear from the EIS how the alternative plan for the staged arrival of spoil trucks from Sydney Ports will be documented and how stakeholders will have an opportunity to assess its impacts. The EIS does not specifically state that this staged arrival plan will be documented in the CTAMP, the Ancillary Facilities Management Plan or the Preferred Infrastructure Report.

I object to the EIS on the grounds that it does not comply with the SEARS.

#### Truck routes

- I object to the EIS because it suggests that no local roads would be used by heavy vehicles during works yet at the same time acknowledges that spoil trucks may use local roads in exceptional circumstances which include when there is queuing to get into the site. Darley Rd is highly congested with traffic queues forming during much of the day which will lead to queues to enter the site. Queuing will not therefore be an exceptional circumstance and the result will be that spoil trucks are able to use local roads without being in breach, which will be often. This is unacceptable to residents of Francis, Hubert, William and Charles St and I object to the EIS on this basis. As queuing cannot be avoided on Darley Rd this clearly shows why this location is inappropriate. The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?

#### Noise impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of fully laden spoil haulage trucks exiting the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt driving up the very steep blind turn at the intersection with the City West Link. The RMS should install noise measuring equipment and monitoring cameras at this location to measure noise from heavy vehicles and identify vehicles whose noise that exceeds the applicable Australian standard.

**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:   | Helen France          |                           |
| Organisation:   |                       |                           |
| Address:  | 48 Charles St- Suburb | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:  | hrfrance@hotmail.com  |                           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No |                       |                           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |                       |                           |

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 impacts

- I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because engine noise from the trucks approaching the intersection up the grade would be a constant source of annoyance to residents of Darley Road down to its intersection with Charles Street.

The independent engineer engaged by the Inner West Council Jim Holt also came to this conclusion in his report to the Council. SMC have not recognised this impact in the EIS. They sent a response to the Council as follows:

**'Response:** Noise from construction traffic using the public road network is assessed under the Roads and Maritime Noise Criteria Guideline (NCG), which documents Roads and Maritime's approach to implementing the Road Noise Policy (RNP). Under the NCG, an initial screening test is carried out to determine whether noise levels would increase by more than two decibels (dBA). This represents an increase in the number of vehicles of approximately 60 per cent due to construction traffic or a temporary reroute due to a road closure. Where increases are 2dBA or less, then further assessment is required as noise level changes would most likely not be perceptible to most people. Where noise levels increase by more than 2dBA (i.e. 2.1 dBA or greater) further assessment is required using criteria presented in the NCG.

Darley Road is currently being used by heavy vehicles and light commercial vehicles (construction, delivery etc) that contribute to background noises. The predicted traffic noise increase (dBA) at the Darley Road site is around 0.5dBA.'

You do not need to be an acoustic engineer to know that truck and dogs are very noisy and that local residents will be impacted greatly, especially those close to where trucks will be accelerating and decelerating. Darley Road, Leichhardt is not currently experiencing 14 truck and dog movements an hour during peak time stated in the EIS and an unknown (but presumably greater) number of truck movements within off peak construction hours. This is a truck movement every 3-4 minutes during peak. Assuming that they will increase truck movements during off peak residents can expect a truck every 2-3 minutes. We do not need a screening test or assessment to tell us that residents will be subjected to extreme levels of truck noise.

SMC's response does not acknowledge this and does not refute Jim Holt's conclusion that residents will be impacted. SMC's response like the proponent's EIS fails to acknowledge the true impact of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.

**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:  | Helen franco  |
| Organisation:  |   |
| Address:   | 48 charles street Suburb, Leichhardt Post Code 2040                   |
| Email:   | hrfranco@hotmail.com  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |   |

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

#### Light rail access

- **I object** to the EIS because it does not guarantee that the existing access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop would be maintained at all times. Fig 6-4 indicates that only the eastern access will be maintained. This greatly disadvantages the elderly and disabled who have to walk up a steep hill to the eastern access. If the proponent cannot guarantee access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop from the existing entry points or from points that are accessible to all then the Darley Road, Leichhardt construction site should be abandoned. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on users of the Light Rail.



#### Noise impacts

- **I object** to the EIS because the proponent's assessment of who are Highly Noise Affected receivers in the area adjacent to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt is incorrect and wrongly minimises the actual number of Highly Noise Affected receivers.

#### Noise impacts

- The proponent has identified that the most affected receivers are residential receivers which adjoin the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on Darley Road between Norton Street and Falls Street. The most noise affected receivers are located between Charles Street and Norton Street due to their proximity to the construction site.

The proponent has identified that the worst case construction scenario will occur during

- Road adjustments works
- spoil handling works within the acoustic shed during all works periods

Highest construction noise impacts:

- Use of a rock breaker during the daytime period as part of the demolition works and
- Use of a road profiler during the night-time period as part of the road adjustment works

**I object** to the EIS because the proponent provides that spoil handling works within the acoustic shed will take place for the duration of the construction phase which could be up to two to three years' duration, yet there is no clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts.

**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:   | Helen France                    |                |
| Organisation:   |                                 |                |
| Address:  | 48 Charles St Suburb Leichhardt | Post Code 2040 |
| Email:  | hrfrance@hotmail.com            |                |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No |                                 |                |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |                                 |                |

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

#### Non-compliance with SEARS

- I object to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and all components and activities (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

The EIS has been released before the proponent is able to describe how it actually plans to carry out construction activities at Darley Road, Leichhardt, in particular the plan for staging the arrival of spoil trucks.

#### Hours of operation

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'Spoil handling associated with tunnelling supported by the Darley Road civil and tunnel site would occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Spoil would be handled below ground wherever practicable to reduce the potential for amenity impacts in adjacent areas. Spoil handing at the surface outside standard day time construction hours would occur within an acoustic shed to manage potential amenity impacts. Spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours, between 7.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

**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:   | Helen France       |        |                           |
| Organisation:   |                    |        |                           |
| Address:  | 48 Charles St      | Suburb | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:  | hrfrance@gmail.com |        |                           |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No |                    |        |                           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |                    |        |                           |

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


**Cumulative impacts of aircraft noise and construction noise**

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and the aircraft noise which the residents near the site already endure.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airservices Australia reports that in April to June 2017 the number of average daily noise events over 70 dBA. In Leichhardt this is an average of 16- 17 per hour over the peak morning period and 16 per hour in the early evening peak period.



I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel engine, exhaust and potentially air brake noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours.

**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:  | <i>Helen France</i>        |                   | <i>Helen France</i> |
| Organisation:  |                            |                   |                     |
| Address:   | 48 Charles Street          | Suburb Leichhardt | Post Code 2040      |
| Email:   | <i>hfranco@hotmail.com</i> |                   |                     |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / <input type="radio"/> No |                            |                   |                     |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |                            |                   |                     |

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

#### Hours of operation

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'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. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

#### Noise impacts

- The resident's of Darley Rd, Francis, Hubert and Charles St have little acoustic protection against the noise of truck engines, exhaust and brakes and none is contemplated in the EIS.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because the truck noise impacts for residents will be too great for the extended period of construction involved and the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt should be rejected on this basis.

**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:  | Helen France                                   |
| Organisation:  |  |
| Address:   | 48 Charles St Suburb Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:   | hrfrance@gmail.com                             |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |  |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.   |  |

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 impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent incorrectly asserts construction traffic is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in LAeq noise levels at receivers along the proposed construction traffic routes (Darley Road, Leichhardt and City West Link). This does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site. The impact of these will be substantial.

Commercial trucks are very loud; a standard diesel engine produces approximately 100 decibels (dB) of noise.

Engine braking noise can be disturbing both because it is loud and also as it has a distinctive characteristic modulation. Engine braking noise is caused by pulses of gases being emitted from the truck exhaust system, giving a 'machine gun' sound.

I object to the Darley Rd site because of the level of noise that the trucks will cause.

#### Truck routes

- I object to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be detailed in the CTAMP, Preferred Infrastructure Report or Ancillary Facilities Management Plan.

Peter Jones of SMC has on many occasions made representations to the community that his plan is to stage trucks from the port and eventually when possible to have them arrive and depart from the site underground when a tunnel is established between Leichhardt and the M4 East. He has also said that loading of spoil would take place underground at this time. He has recently told us of his plan to load trucks from a ramp off the city west link by means of a hopper conveyor which would pass over the Light rail station delivering spoil into silos below which trucks would pull up to receive their load. The laden trucks would then travel west bound along the city west link. None of this plan is detailed in the EIS.

I object to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I object to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into the CTAMP, PIR or AFMP on matters which will have a devastating impact to me and to residents near 7 Darley Rd.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Helen France</u>                 |
|   | Address: <u>42 Chaules street</u>         |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>Glebe</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <u>Helen</u>                   |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 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.
3. The impacts in the EIS are misleading because they do not include any detail of the cumulative impact caused by the overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 (of up to one year). 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 multiple WestConnex projects. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure. Nor does the EIS provide for any traffic management to prevent rat running during the period of construction, when Stages 1 and 2 have opened. The EIS should not be approved without this detail and adequate plans to manage this impact.
4. 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)
5. The EIS states that all vegetation on the Darley Road site will be removed. This includes a mature large tree which provides a visual and noise barrier from the City West Link. The tree should not be permitted to be removed.
6. Despite the fact the EIS identifies over 30 homes with severe noise impacts, no mitigation is mandated. While the possibility of noise walls is flagged, along with in-home treatments, none of this is a requirement. Nor is any detail provided on which residents or business owners can comment. 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>PO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name:      | <i>Helen France</i>      |                      |
|  | Address:   | <i>48 Charles Street</i> |                      |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb:    | <i>Leichhardt</i>        | Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: | <i>Helen</i>             |                      |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Helen France</i>                      |
|  | Address: <i>48 Charles St</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>Helen</i>                        |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

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

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

Name: [REDACTED]

Organisation:

Address: [REDACTED]

Suburb [REDACTED]

Post Code [REDACTED]

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 [REDACTED]

Date 3/10/17

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

- **Contaminated site**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

The proponent rates contamination at this site as a medium risk yet the proponent's track record in managing these risks suggests otherwise.

- In April 2016 Marrickville Council voted to release confidential legal advice which suggested that WestConnex had been operating for months without any legal approval, including in the handling of toxic waste and asbestos.  
(<http://www.southernthunderer.com.au/westconnex-acts-illegally-in-handling-of-toxic-waste-and-asbestos/>)
- In September 2016 it was reported by the ABC that a former employee of Sydney excavation company Moits, Daniel McIntyre, has claimed the company supplied asbestos-laden road base to the WestConnex project.  
(<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-09-01/asbestos-westconnex-allegations-labor-calls-for-works-to-stop/7803378>)
- In August 2017 it was reported by the Parramatta advertiser that Granville and Harris Park residents living in a hotspot asbestos dumping ground, who have been warned not to mow their lawns too short or dig in their back yards for fear of deadly contamination, say they are inhaling dust kicked up by WestConnex trucks.  
(<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/newslocal/parramatta/granville-and-harris-park-residents-fear-contamination-from-asbestos-from-dust-created-by-westconnex-trucks/news-story/853d43d153da6c5edeb64d1043booc68>)
- In August 2017 the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has fined WestConnex contractors CPR Contractors & Media for an investigation into the emission of offensive odours  
<http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/cpamedia/EPAMedia030817.htm>
- On numerous occasions in Campbell Street St Peters residents have observed inadequate and dangerous risk asbestos management practices by WestConnex contractors such as using hoses to damp down dust and material containing asbestos without wearing protective clothing.

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because of the impact that disturbance of asbestos and other contaminants will have on health and on property. The community should not be put at risk when a dive site is not necessary.

**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:   |              |        |           |
| Organisation:   |              |        |           |
| Address:  |              | Suburb | Post Code |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 3/10/17 |        |           |

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

- **Dust emission from construction activities**

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because the proponent has failed to comply with the SEARS requirement in relation to Air quality, that the project is designed, constructed and operated in a manner that minimises air quality impacts (including nuisance dust and odour) to minimise risks to human health and the environment to the greatest extent practicable.

The proponent appears to downplay the impact of dust emission from construction activities by stating that '**It is difficult to reliably quantify dust emissions from construction activities. Due to the variability of the weather it is impossible to predict what the weather conditions would be when specific construction activities are undertaken.**'

This is an astonishing statement given the fact that the proponent is undertaking identical construction activities at numerous other sites as part of Stages 1 and 2 of the project. The proponent should by now be able to reduce any risks and impacts to zero in all weather circumstances. The proponent has failed to demonstrate that it is capable of managing risks that are capable of being managed and its proposals for the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt should be rejected on this basis.

The proponent appears to downplay the impact of dust emission from construction activities further by stating that 'Any effects of construction on airborne particle concentrations would also generally be temporary and relatively short-lived.' This is also an astonishing statement given that a consequence of even one exposure to asbestos is fatal lung disease, not to mention the risk to children and adults with asthma. One asthma attack can result in death.

I object to the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt because it creates an unacceptable risk to the health of workers and residents due to the dust impacts from demolition and construction and in addition will cause loss of amenity to residents.

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

Name: ..... *SUSAN TRENHOLM*  
 Signature: ..... *S. Trenholm*

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

Address: ..... 35 HUBERT 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 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents to not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- 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.

---

**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: ..... *Vera Ford C*

Signature: ..... *Kathy*

*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 Corro St*

Suburb: ..... *Darley (NSW)* 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


Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5  
Link

- 4 We 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.
- 4 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.
- 4 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.
- 4 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.
- 4 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.
- 4 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Colin Messe</u>  |
|   | Address: <u>14 High St</u>  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>Marrickville</u> Postcode <u>2204</u>  |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature:  |
| <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |   |

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

1. SMC has 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.
2. 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 until critical 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.
3. At 7-25 the EIS 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.
4. The EIS acknowledges at 7-41 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.
5. 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 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. There are no further details provided. Again, this casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
6. 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.

**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: ..... *Colin Hosse*  
 Signature: ..... *Colin*

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: ..... 14 High St  
 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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

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 \_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Attention Director</b><br/> <b>Application Number:</b> SSI 7485 Application<br/> <b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b><br/> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b><br/> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b><br/> <b>Application Name:</b> WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> | <p>Name: <i>Colin Hesse</i></p> <p>Signature: <i>C H</i></p> <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website. I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Address: <i>14 High St</i></p> <p>Suburb: <i>Marrickville</i> Postcode <i>2209</i></p> |
|--|--|

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

- 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.
- No road junction as large and complex as the extraordinary spaghetti junction proposed to go underground has been built anywhere in the world. The feasibility is not tested. There are no international or national standards for such a 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.
- 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 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.
- 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.
- 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).
- 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.
- I strongly object to the privatisation of the WestConnex project that turns public monies into private profit.
- 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.

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Jo Williams</u>                      |
|  | Address: <u>85 Yelverton St</u>               |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>BURDENHAM</u> Postcode <u>2044</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <u>gw</u>                          |
| <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br/>           Declaration: I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |   |

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

1. SMC has 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.
2. 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** until critical 'uncertainties' have been fully researched and surveyed and the results (and any changes) published for public comment.
3. At 7-25 the EIS 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.
4. The EIS acknowledges at 7-41 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.
5. 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 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. There are no further details provided. Again, this casts doubt over the integrity of the entire EIS process.
6. 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.

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Jo Williams</u>   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Address: <u>85 Yelverton St</u>                                    |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Suburb: <u>Sydney</u> Postcode <u>2004</u><br>Signature: <u>Jo</u> |
| <p>Please <u>include / delete (cross out or circle)</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p>Declaration: I <u>HAVE NOT</u> made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |  |

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. I completely reject the idea 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.
7. I have read the warm and caring words contained in the EIS, ref Sustainability Management Strategy. What purpose do these serve if they are not reflected in actual plans. They simply highlight the wanton destruction of homes, trees and habitat already.
8. 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>
9. 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.

For these and many other reasons, I urge the Secretary of Planning to advise the Minister to reject this 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: \_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Attention Director</b><br/>Application Number: SSI 7485</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br/>Department of Planning and Environment<br/>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> | <p>Name: <u>Diana Evans</u></p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Please <u>include</u> / <u>delete</u> (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.</p> <p>Address: <u>21-21 Enmore Rd</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Enmore</u> Postcode <u>2042</u></p> |
|--|--|

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

- a. 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?
- b. 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.
- c. 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.
- d. It is 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.
- e. 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.
- f. 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.
- g. 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.
- h. 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. 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.
- j. 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: DAN HURS

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: 21 - 25 Enmore Rd

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- o 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.
- o Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?
- o 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.
- o I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.

**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 \_\_\_\_\_

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Attention Director</b><br/> <b>Application Number:</b> SSI 7485 Application</p> <p><b>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,</b><br/> <b>Department of Planning and Environment</b><br/> <b>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</b></p> <p><b>Application Name:</b> WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> | <p>Name: <u>Kirby Sharroek, nich</u></p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>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.</p> <p>Address: <u>59 premier st</u></p> <p>Suburb: <u>Marrickville</u> Postcode <u>2204</u>.</p> |
|--|---|

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

- 1. 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.
- 2. 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.
- 3. 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.
- 4. Why the so called 'King Street Gateway' been excluded in the analysis of cumulative impacts of other projects ?
- 5. 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.
- 6. I object to the fact that the WestConnex Traffic Model has not been released to Councils and the community.
- 7. 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.
- 8. 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.
- 9. 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.
- 10. 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.

**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: Kira De Haye

Signature: Kira De Haye

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: 17 LOFTUS ST

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

Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- 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 ?
- 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.
- 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.
- 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*

**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: ..... Nancy Grimes .....

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: ..... 8/5 ALFRED ST .....

Suburb: ..... LILYFIELD NSW ..... 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

- A. 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.
- B. 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.
- C. 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.
- D. 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.
- E. 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.
- F. 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.
- G. I 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.

*DATE: 7/10/17*

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:   | Krush Edrala  | Suburb | ST Peters | Post Code |
| Address:  | 48 Edrala st  |        |           |           |
| Signature:  |  |        |           | 2064      |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No |   |        |           |           |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |   |        |           |           |

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 impacts

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because engine noise from the trucks approaching the intersection up the grade would be a constant source of annoyance to residents of Darley Road down to its intersection with Charles Street.

The independent engineer engaged by the Inner West Council Jim Holt also came to this conclusion in his report to the Council. SMC have not recognised this impact in the EIS. They sent a response to the Council as follows:

**'Response:** Noise from construction traffic using the public road network is assessed under the Roads and Maritime Noise Criteria Guideline (NCG), which documents Roads and Maritime's approach to implementing the Road Noise Policy (RNP). Under the NCG, an initial screening test is carried out to determine whether noise levels would increase by more than two decibels (dBA). This represents an increase in the number of vehicles of approximately 60 per cent due to construction traffic or a temporary reroute due to a road closure. Where increases are 2dBA or less, then further assessment is required as noise level changes would most likely not be perceptible to most people. Where noise levels increase by more than 2dBA (i.e. 2.1 dBA or greater) further assessment is required using criteria presented in the NCG.

Darley Road is currently being used by heavy vehicles and light commercial vehicles (construction, delivery etc) that contribute to background noises. The predicted traffic noise increase (dBA) at the Darley Road site is around 0.5dBA.'

You do not need to be an acoustic engineer to know that truck and dogs are very noisy and that local residents will be impacted greatly, especially those close to where trucks will be accelerating and decelerating. Darley Road, Leichhardt is not currently experiencing 14 truck and dog movements an hour during peak time stated in the EIS and an unknown (but presumably greater) number of truck movements within off peak construction hours. This is a truck movement every 3-4 minutes during peak. Assuming that they will increase truck movements during off peak residents can expect a truck every 2-3 minutes. We do not need a screening test or assessment to tell us that residents will be subjected to extreme levels of truck noise.

SMC's response does not acknowledge this and does not refute Jim Holt's conclusion that residents will be impacted. SMC's response like the proponent's EIS fails to acknowledge the true impact of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.

The resident's of Darley Rd, Francis, Hubert and Charles St have little acoustic protection against the noise of truck engines, exhaust and brakes and non is contemplated in the EIS.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because the truck noise impacts for residents will be too great for the extended period of construction involved and the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt should be rejected on this basis.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Submission from:   | Submission to:  |
| Name: <u>VINCENZO RIEMITA</u>  | Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 |
| Signature:    | Attn: Director – Transport Assessments  |
| <i>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> |   |
| Address: <u>4 GIPPS ST</u>   | Application Number: SSI 7485 Application  |
| Suburb: <u>BANDWELL VISION</u> Postcode <u>2207</u>  | 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 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Darley Road is confirmed as a 'civil and tunnel site (dive site) with a 'Motorway Operations' site at one end for machinery during the build and will then house permanent water treatment facilities, despite evidence tendered to the Concept Design explaining that this intersection has an high accident rate and is completely unsuitable for such a purpose.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Dixie Rayner-Evans</i>               |
|  | Address: <i>13 Eden St</i>                    |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>Chatswood</i> Postcode <i>2067</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>                 |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. I object 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.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically provide that all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
4. 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.
5. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed or any detail provided. 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 uninhabitable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
6. The EIS does not even 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.

---

**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: ..... *Leonardo Prentico* .....  
Signature: ..... *[Handwritten signature]* .....

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

Address: ..... *100 Francis Street* .....  
Suburb: ..... *Leichhardt NSW* ..... 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

4 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.

4 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.

4 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.

- 4 No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents to not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets.
- 4 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.

**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: ..... *Leonardo Pernotico*  
 Signature: ..... 

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

Address: ..... 100 Francis Street  
 Suburb: ..... Leichhardt NSW Postcode..... 2040

④ We 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.

④ 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.

④ The EIS states that, if the current proposal for ventilation facilities do not manage to achieve

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

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.

- ④ 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.
- ④ 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.
- ④ 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.

**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: ..... *Leonards Penrith* .....  
Signature: ..... *[Signature]* .....

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

Address: ..... 100 Francis Street .....  
Suburb: ..... Leichhardt NSW ..... Postcode: ..... 2040

- 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)
- 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)
- The EIS states that investigation would be undertaken to confirm whether the Victoria Road bridge is a potential roost site for microbats. There will be attempts to 'manage potential impacts' if confirmed. This is inadequate. The project should not be permitted to impact on vulnerable species.
- 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

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

other measures at appropriate locations to lessen the impact on visual amenity. (Executive Summary xviii)

- 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 construction and operation of the project will result in 51 property acquisitions. We object to the project in its entirety because of this impact. We note that a number of long-standing businesses have been acquired and that many families and businesses in earlier stages have been forced to go to court to seek fair compensation. We object to the acquisition in particular of the Dan Murphys site. The business was substantially renovated and a new business opened with full knowledge of the likely acquisition. We object to it being acquired and compensated in this circumstances and call on the Government to investigate the circumstances which led to this occurring (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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: Leonardo Pernfio

Submission to:

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

Application Number: SSI 7485

Address: 100 Francis Street  
Suburb: Dichhardt NSW Postcode 2040

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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name: ..... *Leonardo Prem Alzo*

Signature: ..... *[Signature]*

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

Address: ..... *100 Francis St*

Suburb: ..... *Wishart NSW* 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 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.

¶ 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.

¶ 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 all vegetation will be removed on the site which includes a mature tree. I object to the removal of the tree which creates a visual and noise barrier for residents from the City West Link. If the tree is removed it must be replaced with a mature tree as soon as the remediation of the site commences.
- ¶ 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 on this site.
- ¶ 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.

**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: ..... Leonardo Pernicchio .....

Signature: ..... 

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

Declaration : I

Address: ..... 100 Francis Street .....

Suburb: ..... Leichhardt NSW .....

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 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.

¶ 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.

- ¶ The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically mention all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
- ¶ 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 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.

**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:..... *Henry Francis*

Signature:..... *H.F.*

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

**Declaration:** I

Address:..... *100 Francis St*

Suburb: ..... *Lichardt NSW* 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 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.
- # 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 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

**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:  | <i>Michael Prentico</i> |          |                           |
| Organisation:  |                         |          |                           |
| Address:   | 100 Francis Street      | Suburb:  | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:   | <i>mjh@jones.com.au</i> |          |                           |
| 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.   |                         |          |                           |

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

#### Truck routes

- I **object** to the EIS because it suggests that no local roads would be used by heavy vehicles during works yet at the same time acknowledges that spoil trucks may use local roads in exceptional circumstances which include when there is queuing to get into the site. Darley Rd is highly congested with traffic queues forming during much of the day which will lead to queues to enter the site. Queuing will not therefore be an exceptional circumstance and the result will be that spoil trucks are able to use local roads without being in breach, which will be often. This is unacceptable to residents of Francis, Hubert, William and Charles St and I **object** to the EIS on this basis. As queuing cannot be avoided on Darley Rd this clearly shows why this location is inappropriate. The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?
- I **object** to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site, which SMC have on many occasions told the community they are contemplating as alternatives.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that 'It is anticipated that the majority of construction traffic would enter the site from the southern (westbound) carriageway of Darley Road, Leichhardt via new driveways. Heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt. A temporary right turning lane at the intersection of City West Link and Darley Road, Leichhardt would be provided for use by construction vehicles. Heavy vehicles would exit the site by turning left onto Darley Road, Leichhardt before turning left onto City West Link.'

'Construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) via the westbound lanes of City West Link.'

'Temporary traffic management measures would be established to enable access and egress arrangements. These would be detailed in a CTAMP, which would be prepared to manage construction traffic associated with the project.'

I **object** to the proposal for vehicles associated with spoil haulage to travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Rd. This proposal is dangerous and the impacts and risks are too great. Darley Rd is acknowledged by RMS to be a sub-standard road in terms of its construction. The intersection from the city west link is a steep blind turn even for traffic coming across from James St. This is followed by immediate left hand turns into both Francis St and Hubert St. A number of properties on Darley Rd would be at risk of destruction from spoil haulage trucks in the event of a truck having to brake suddenly to avoid stationary vehicles.

The proponent should abandon a dive site completely or find a location directly on the City West Link where spoil trucks will never use local roads. Why should residents' lives be put at risk because the project must be delivered as soon as possible?

- I **object** to the EIS because it fails to describe the truck route options available to the proponent in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be detailed in the CTAMP, Preferred Infrastructure Report or Ancillary Facilities Management Plan.

Peter Jones of SMC has on many occasions made representations to the community that his plan is to stage trucks from the port and eventually when possible to have them arrive and depart from the site underground when a tunnel is established between Leichhardt and the M4 East. He has also said that loading of spoil would take place underground at this time. He has recently told us of his plan to load trucks from a ramp off the city west link by means of a hopper conveyor which would pass over the Light rail station delivering spoil into silos below which trucks would pull up to receive their load. The laden trucks would then travel west bound along the city west link. None of this plan is detailed in the EIS.

I **object** to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I **object** to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into the CTAMP, PIR or AFMP on matters which will have a devastating impact to me and to residents near 7 Darley Rd.

**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:  | Michael Premutto       |          |                           |
| Organisation:  |                        |          |                           |
| Address:   | 100 Francis Street     | Suburb   | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:   | M.Premutto@bigpond.com |          |                           |
| 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.   |                        |          |                           |

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 impacts

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because engine noise from the trucks approaching the intersection up the grade would be a constant source of annoyance to residents of Darley Road down to its intersection with Charles Street.

The independent engineer engaged by the Inner West Council Jim Holt also came to this conclusion in his report to the Council. SMC have not recognised this impact in the EIS. They sent a response to the Council as follows:

**'Response:** Noise from construction traffic using the public road network is assessed under the Roads and Maritime Noise Criteria Guideline (NCG), which documents Roads and Maritime's approach to implementing the Road Noise Policy (RNP). Under the NCG, an initial screening test is carried out to determine whether noise levels would increase by more than two decibels (dBA). This represents an increase in the number of vehicles of approximately 60 per cent due to construction traffic or a temporary reroute due to a road closure. Where increases are 2dBA or less, then further assessment is required as noise level changes would most likely not be perceptible to most people. Where noise levels increase by more than 2dBA (i.e. 2.1 dBA or greater) further assessment is required using criteria presented in the NCG.

Darley Road is currently being used by heavy vehicles and light commercial vehicles (construction, delivery etc) that contribute to background noises. The predicted traffic noise increase (dBA) at the Darley Road site is around 0.5dBA.'

You do not need to be an acoustic engineer to know that truck and dogs are very noisy and that local residents will be impacted greatly, especially those close to where trucks will be accelerating and decelerating. Darley Road, Leichhardt is not currently experiencing 14 truck and dog movements an hour during peak time stated in the EIS and an unknown (but presumably greater) number of truck movements within off peak construction hours. This is a truck movement every 3-4 minutes during peak. Assuming that they will increase truck movements during off peak residents can expect a truck every 2-3 minutes. We do not need a screening test or assessment to tell us that residents will be subjected to extreme levels of truck noise.

SMC's response does not acknowledge this and does not refute Jim Holt's conclusion that residents will be impacted. SMC's response like the proponent's EIS fails to acknowledge the true impact of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.

The residents of Darley Rd, Francis, Hubert and Charles St have little acoustic protection against the noise of truck engines, exhaust and brakes and none is contemplated in the EIS.

I object to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt because the truck noise impacts for residents will be too great for the extended period of construction involved and the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt should be rejected on this basis.

**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:  | Michael Premutico  |          |                           |
| Organisation:  |                    |          |                           |
| Address:   | 100 Francis Street | Suburb   | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:   | <i>mfp@me.com</i>  |          |                           |
| 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.   |                    |          |                           |

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 impacts

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has not provided details of the noise mitigation measures proposed in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. As a result it is not possible to assess the noise impacts of the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt. It is unacceptable for the proponent to establish a major construction site in the middle of a residential area without a clear plan for mitigating noise impacts.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) 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. In addition, temporary noise mitigation measures may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings, which would be provided to minimise noise impacts on surrounding properties.'

- Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) will create a high level of noise impact for residents yet the proponent has not given details of the plan for mitigating this impact. The measures will be implemented only if 'reasonable and feasible' which is a subjective assessment as it does not state whether they will be assessed as reasonable from the standpoint of the proponent or the residents. What the proponent thinks is reasonable may not meet the residents expectation as to what is reasonable. The measures appear to be optional as the proponent only states that 'may include noise barriers and other temporary structures such as site buildings'.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has not provided a clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts from work within and outside of standard construction hours at the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the fact that the demolition of 7 Darley Road, Leichhardt will remove a significant noise barrier to traffic noise from the City West Link. This will mean increased traffic noise impacts to the residents of Darley Rd, Francis St, Hubert St and Charles St.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of fully laden spoil haulage trucks exiting the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt driving up the very steep blind turn at the intersection with the City West Link. The RMS should install noise measuring equipment and monitoring cameras at this location to measure noise from heavy vehicles and identify vehicles whose noise exceeds the applicable Australian standard.
- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the noise impact of spoil haulage trucks using air brakes on the descent down Darley Rd off the City West Link. Heavy vehicle drivers should avoid using exhaust brakes, engine compression or 'jake' brakes near residential areas and noise-sensitive areas such as hospitals and schools, unless they are necessary for safety reasons. RMS should implement noise limits from engine compression brakes and should use roadside noise 'cameras' as an aid to enforcement at every location where WestConnex vehicles emitting engine compression brake noise might affect nearby communities.

**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:   | <i>Michael Premutto</i> |        |                           |
| Organisation:   |                         |        |                           |
| Address:  | 100 Frances Street      | Suburb | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:  | <i>Scorched Moments</i> |        |                           |
| 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.            |                         |        |                           |

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

#### Non-compliance with SEARS

**I object** to the proposal because it does not comply with the SEARS requirements. The EIS must include, but not necessarily be limited to, a description of the project and **all components and activities** (including ancillary components and activities) required to construct and operate it, including the location and operational requirements of construction ancillary facilities and access.

In so far as it describes the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt the EIS does not meet this requirement because it does not describe the components and activities that have been described to the community either in meetings with LAW (Leichhardt Against WestConnex) or at the WestConnex Community Reference Group established by Sydney Motorway Corporation.

The EIS has been released before the proponent is able to describe how it actually plans to carry out construction activities at Darley Road, Leichhardt, in particular the plan for staging the arrival of spoil trucks.

The proponent via its agent Sydney Motorway Corporation's employee Peter Jones has advised on several occasions that spoil haulage trucks will be staged from the Sydney Ports land on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. This is to avoid the situation at Haberfield where trucks circle the Northcote St site as they are not able to queue to enter it creating congestion and noise impacts as they drive slowly into Wattle St and Ramsay St. before making a second run at the Northcote St site from the Parramatta Road entrance.

No details of this staged spoil haulage proposal at Darley Road, Leichhardt are provided other than that 'construction traffic may also access the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt via the westbound lanes of City West Link'.

Peter Jones from Sydney Motorway Corporation has advised that he is in the process of finalising an agreement with Sydney Ports which will enable him to stage trucks from a location on Glebe Island via James Craig Rd. The EIS should not have been released before this plan was finalised. Peter Jones has advised that he is only required to describe the 'worst case scenario' in the EIS, which is trucks arriving ad hoc via the eastbound lanes of City West Link. The EIS should describe what the proponent actually plans to do as well as the worst case scenario so that the impacts of all options being considered can be assessed and commented on.

It is not clear from the EIS how the alternative plan for the staged arrival of spoil trucks from Sydney Ports will be documented and how stakeholders will have an opportunity to assess its impacts. The EIS does not specifically state that this staged arrival plan will be documented in the CTAMP, the Ancillary Facilities Management Plan or the Preferred Infrastructure Report.

**I object** to the EIS on the grounds that it does not comply with the SEARS.

#### Construction vehicle safety impacts

**I object** to the EIS because the proposal in relation to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt stated therein, that 'heavy vehicles associated with spoil haulage would travel eastbound on City West Link and turn right into Darley Road, Leichhardt' presents unacceptable safety and amenity impacts.

The corner of Darley Rd (actually James St) and the City West Link is a pedestrian zone for:

- Pupils of Orange Grove Public School who live in Leichhardt
- Students of Sydney Secondary College, Leichhardt Campus who alight at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Students of other schools along the light rail who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Commuters who board at Leichhardt North light rail stop
- Residents walking to Leichhardt Park Aquatic Centre and adjacent sporting facilities
- Residents walking to the Orange Grove markets on Saturdays

The proponents plan brings pedestrians and school children in particular directly into the path of spoil haulage trucks at an intersection found to be the third most dangerous according to Transport for NSW figures.

A further impact will be to discourage people from walking in this area leading to greater car use for local trips.

**I object** to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the above grounds.

**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:  | <i>Michael Premutico</i> |                                  |
| Organisation:  |                          |                                  |
| Address:   | 100 Francis Street       | Suburb Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:   | <i>MPremitico</i>        |                                  |
| 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.   |                          |                                  |

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

#### Hours of operation

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'Spoil handling associated with tunnelling supported by the Darley Road civil and tunnel site would occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Spoil would be handled below ground wherever practicable to reduce the potential for amenity impacts in adjacent areas. Spoil handling at the surface outside standard day time construction hours would occur within an acoustic shed to manage potential amenity impacts. Spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours, between 7.00 am and 6.00 pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

- I object to the EIS because it is effectively a 24 hour operation despite the fact that the proponent represents that spoil removal from this site would only occur within standard construction hours.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4):

'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. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would be kept informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site.'

The EIS allows for the possibility of spoil handling above ground 24 hours 7 days a week. The EIS fails to assess or explain the impacts of this on the residents in nearby streets. These impacts could include construction noise, light and heavy vehicles (other than spoil trucks), workers arriving for shifts and leaving after shifts. It is not clear to what extent the acoustic shed will contain noise. The Jim Holt report stated that the acoustic shed would not operate effectively due to its location on the site. It is not clear whether the proponent will mandate the contractor to employ the highest level of acoustic protection rather than what is feasible.

I object to the EIS because the proponent/contractor would only have to keep local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA informed about works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. Local residents, businesses and the NSW EPA would have no right to limit works outside standard day time construction hours at the site. As we have seen with other stages of WestConnex this leads to devastating impacts for residents who must endure significant periods of exposure to out of hours works which involve noise, lights and disturbance.

I object to the EIS and the Darley Rd construction site. The proponent should be directed to abandon its plan for a dive site as it is clear impacts are too great for the community. At the very least the site should be restricted to standard construction hours for all operations above ground and there should be no shifts commencing or ending outside of standard construction hours. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on residents outside of standard construction hours.

**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:  | <b>Michael Premutico</b> |          |            |
| Organisation:  |                          |          |            |
| Address:   | 100 Francis street       | Suburb   | Leichhardt |
| Email:   | M.Premutico@bigpond.com  |          |            |
| 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.   |                          |          |            |

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

#### Pedestrian and cyclist movements

- I **object** to the EIS because it fails to describe the temporary changes to Darley Road, Leichhardt to enable access to and from the ancillary facility that would likely be required in relation to the Darley Rd site and instead allows for the final plan to be decided by the contractor.

The EIS states in 6.5.8 Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) that:

'Temporary changes to Darley Road to enable access to and from the ancillary facility would likely be required. These may include changes to line marking to provide a temporary turning lane for construction traffic and temporary diversions to the pedestrian path on the northern side of Darley Road. These would be confirmed during detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor and in consideration of the safety and function of the road network, maintaining access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop and providing for continued pedestrian and cyclist movement.'

It is not clear how continued access, pedestrian and cyclist movement will be preserved and I am concerned that the impacts have not been correctly identified and assessed by the proponent.

I **object** to the fact that I am denied the opportunity to assess the impacts of all options. I **object** to the fact that I will have no right or opportunity to have input into detailed design following the appointment of a design and construction contractor.

#### Light rail access

- I **object** to the EIS because it does not guarantee that the existing access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop would be maintained at all times. Fig 6-4 indicates that only the eastern access will be maintained. This greatly disadvantages the elderly and disabled who have to walk up a steep hill to the eastern access. If the proponent cannot guarantee access to the Leichhardt North light rail stop from the existing entry points or from points that are accessible to all then the Darley Road, Leichhardt construction site should be abandoned. The proponent should be directed to find a site where its operations will not impact on users of the Light Rail.




Figure 6-4 Project footprint - Map 2

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:  | <i>Michael Premutto</i>       |          |                           |
| Organisation:  |                               |          |                           |
| Address:   | 100 Francis Street            | Suburb   | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:   | <i>m.premutto@bigpond.com</i> |          |                           |
| 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.   |                               |          |                           |

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


#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft noise and construction noise

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and the aircraft noise which the residents near the site already endure.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airservices Australia reports that in April to June 2017 the number of average daily noise events over 70 dBA. In Leichhardt this is an average of 16- 17 per hour over the peak morning period and 16 per hour in the early evening peak period.



I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel engine, exhaust and potentially air brake noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours.

**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:  | <u>Michael Premusic</u>   |        |                   |
| Organisation:  |                           |        |                   |
| Address:   | <u>100 Francis Street</u> | Suburb | <u>Leichhardt</u> |
| Email:   | <u>m.premusic</u>         |        |                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website      Yes / No |                           |        |                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.                 |                           |        |                   |

**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 impacts

- The proponent has identified that the most affected receivers are residential receivers which adjoin the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on Darley Road between Norton Street and Falls Street. The most noise affected receivers are located between Charles Street and Norton Street due to their proximity to the construction site.

The proponent has identified that the worst case construction scenario will occur during

- Road adjustments works
- spoil handling works within the acoustic shed during all works periods

Highest construction noise impacts:

- Use of a rock breaker during the daytime period as part of the demolition works and
- Use of a road profiler during the night-time period as part of the road adjustment works

**I object** to the EIS because the proponent provides that spoil handling works within the acoustic shed will take place for the duration of the construction phase which could be up to two to three years' duration, yet there is no clear plan for measures that will be taken to minimise noise impacts.

- I object** to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt on the basis that there is no clear plan in the EIS for measures that will provide the maximum possible level of mitigation from noise impacts. I also object because there is no clear plan for remedies available to residents who are impacted.
- I object** to the EIS because the proponent's assessment of who are Highly Noise Affected receivers in the area adjacent to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site (C4) at Leichhardt is incorrect and wrongly minimises the actual number of Highly Noise Affected receivers.
- Many residents in Charles St and Hubert St were highly affected by noise from works conducted during the renovation of 7 Darley Rd in 2016. In Hubert St, residents at least as far as No 31 and No 32 Hubert St were affected. The affected properties are not correctly reflected in the EIS.

**I object** to the EIS because it underestimates the number of residents that will be highly affected by noise. It does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site.

- I object** to the EIS because the proponent incorrectly asserts construction traffic is unlikely to result in a noticeable increase in LAeq noise levels at receivers along the proposed construction traffic routes (Darley Road, Leichhardt and City West Link). This does not take account of the impact of vehicle noise from fully laden spoil trucks driving up the very steep incline from Darley Rd to the City West Link. It does not take account of the noise impact of vehicles using air brakes down the same incline and braking to enter the site. The impact of these will be substantial.

Commercial trucks are very loud; a standard diesel engine produces approximately 100 decibels (dB) of noise.

Engine braking noise can be disturbing both because it is loud and also as it has a distinctive characteristic modulation. Engine braking noise is caused by pulses of gases being emitted from the truck exhaust system, giving a 'machine gun' sound.

**I object** to the Darley Rd site because of the level of noise that the trucks will cause..

**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:  | <u>Michael Prenciches</u>        |          |                           |
| Organisation:  |                                  |          |                           |
| Address  | 600 Francis Street               | suburb   | Leichhardt Post Code 2040 |
| Email:   | <u>michael@prenciches.com.au</u> |          |                           |
| 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.   |                                  |          |                           |

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

#### Cumulative impacts of aircraft emissions and spoil truck emissions

- I object to the EIS because the proponent has failed to take account of the cumulative impact of emissions from spoil truck vehicles from its proposed Darley Road, Leichhardt civil and tunnel site operations and emissions from aircraft to which residents near the site are already exposed.

The attached extract from Webtrak shows that Darley Road, Leichhardt and adjacent streets are directly under the flight path.



Airplane exhaust, like car exhaust, contains a variety of air pollutants, including sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Many of these particles of pollution are tiny, about a hundred millionths of an inch wide, or smaller than the width of a human hair. So-called particulate matter that's especially small is the main culprit in human health effects, especially since the particulates can become wedged deep in the lung and possibly enter the bloodstream, scientists say.

Exposure to loud noise from living under a flight path over a long period of time may increase the risk of developing high blood pressure or having a stroke, a 2013 study by researchers at the University of Athens suggests.

Researchers examined data from 420 people living near busy Athens International Airport in Greece and found living with high noise levels from aircraft, especially at night, was associated with high blood pressure.

Every additional 10 decibels of night-time aircraft noise appeared to result in a 69 per cent increased risk of high blood pressure, also known as hypertension.

The researchers at the University of Athens found that around half the participants (just under 45 per cent) were exposed to more than 55 decibels of daytime aircraft noise, while around one in four (just over 27 per cent) were exposed to more than 45 decibels of night-time aircraft noise.

Only around one in 10 (11 per cent) were exposed to significant road traffic noise of more than 55 decibels.

Between 2004-6 and 2013, 71 people were newly diagnosed with high blood pressure and 44 were diagnosed with heart flutter (cardiac arrhythmia), while a further 18 had a heart attack, the researchers found.

I object to the plan for a construction site on Darley Rd because in addition to the existing aircraft emissions and noise experienced by people living near the site, this will mean an additional cumulative impact of spoil truck diesel exhaust emissions and noise every 4 minutes in peak hour based on number of truck movements per hour and in excess of every 4 minutes per hour in non peak permitted construction hours. This will give rise to increased health risks from noise and air pollution which research suggest will cause increased blood pressure and risk of stroke.

|   |            |                                    |
|---|------------|------------------------------------|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name:      | <i>Mr Clinton McNamee</i>          |
|   | Address:   | <i>168 CAMDEN ST</i>               |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb:    | <i>EMMONG</i> Postcode <i>2042</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: | <i>[Signature]</i>                 |
| <p><i>Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</i></p> <p><b>Declaration:</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |            |                                    |

**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 therefore impossible 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 \_\_\_\_\_

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <i>Simon Chisholm</i>                    |
|   | Address: <i>20/69 Allen St</i>                 |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link  | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>                  |
| Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br><b>Declaration :</b> 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Suzan Chisholm</i>                    |
|  | Address: <i>20/62 Allen St</i>                 |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>Suzan</i>                        |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 (following 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Simon Chisholm</i>                    |
|  | Address: <i>20/6a Allen St</i>                 |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>Simon</i>                        |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Simon Chisholm</i>                    |
|  | Address: <i>20/61 Allen st</i>                 |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link   | Signature: <i>SCM</i>                          |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br><b>Declaration:</b> 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Simon Chisholm</u>   |
|  | Address: <u>20/69 Allen St</u>  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2046</u>  |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature:  |
| <p>Please <b>INCLUDE</b> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website</p> <p><b>Declaration :</b> I HAVE NOT made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.</p> |   |

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 \_\_\_\_\_

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Submission to : Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001 | Name: <u>Laura &amp; Pierre Maroney</u><br>Signature:   |
| Attention: Director – Transport Assessments   | <small>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.</small> |
| Application Number: SSI 7485<br>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link                                       | Address: <u>302 Elswick Street</u><br>Suburb: <u>LEICHHARDT</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>  |

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 Laura Maroney Email ldgm3121@gmail.com Mobile 0466324432

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: <u>MATTHEW ZEREMES</u>  |
|   | Address: <u>89 Francis St</u>   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u>  |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature:  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 has many caveats and depends upon further steps (such as traffic management plans), the detail of which is not provided. The community has no certainty that any of the impacts from construction will be managed to an acceptable level.
3. 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.
4. 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)
5. 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)
6. There are 36 homes identified as having severe noise impacts during construction in Leichhardt and Lilyfield. No noise barriers have been identified so residents are unable to comment as to whether this impact will be reduced. No proposal for alternative accommodation is provided. This is unacceptable and all of the proposed noise mitigation options should be detailed in the EIS so that residents have an opportunity to comment on what is proposed. (Executive Summary xvii)
7. There is no plan to manage traffic on Darley Road proposed in the EIS. This critical arterial road is regularly congested at peak periods. Reference in the EIS to developing a traffic management plan in the future is not acceptable. The detail of what is proposed needs to be contained in the EIS so that residents can assess whether the impact of 170 light and heavy vehicle movements a day in and out of the site can be acceptably managed.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: Matt Zeeane   |
|   | Address: 89 Francis St  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040  |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature:  |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 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.
3. The impacts in the EIS are misleading because they do not include any detail of the cumulative impact caused by the overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 (of up to one year). 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 multiple WestConnex projects. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure. Nor does the EIS provide for any traffic management to prevent rat running during the period of construction, when Stages 1 and 2 have opened. The EIS should not be approved without this detail and adequate plans to manage this impact.
4. 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)
5. The EIS states that all vegetation on the Darley Road site will be removed. This includes a mature large tree which provides a visual and noise barrier from the City West Link. The tree should not be permitted to be removed.
6. Despite the fact the EIS identifies over 30 homes with severe noise impacts, no mitigation is mandated. While the possibility of noise walls is flagged, along with in-home treatments, none of this is a requirement. Nor is any detail provided on which residents or business owners can comment. 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Matt Zeremus</u>                      |
|   | Address: <u>89 francis St</u>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <u>M Zeremus</u>                    |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. I object 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.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically provide that all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
4. 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.
5. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed or any detail provided. 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 uninhabitable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
6. The EIS does not even 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: Matt Zorcmer<br>Address: 89 Francis st  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2046  |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature:  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. 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. The EIS does not mention that 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <i>Matt Zercones</i>                     |
|   | Address: <i>89 Francis St</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>Eve Jones</i>                    |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website.<br>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:

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 as it will create unacceptable noise impacts for the community and lead to traffic chaos, along with creating an increased risk of accidents to pedestrians and cycle users.
2. The substation and water treatment plant proposed for Darley Road should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link so that it is less visible to residents. 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. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the acknowledged constraints of the Darley Rd 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, as pertains to the Darley Road site, needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.
4. At the conclusion of the construction period, the Darley Road 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 approval conditions need to mandate that the Darley Rd site is to be preserved as green space or other community purposes at the conclusion of the construction period.
5. No trucks (heavy or light) should be permitted on any streets adjacent to Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street). A blanket prohibition should be in force with respect to any worker vehicles from the construction site parking on these local streets. These homes will already suffer the worst construction impacts and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and the additional noise impacts of additional cars on their street. These local streets are not designed to handle heavy vehicle movements. Therefore, any approval conditions need to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all local streets adjacent to Darley Road.
6. Any approval conditions and the relevant construction contracts must require that all workers to the Darley Rd site are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail, with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads adjacent to the Darley Road site. The site currently provides only 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.

**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: KATIE HUBBARD

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: 10A STANMORE 31 LINCOLN ST

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

- ◊ The WestConnex route has changed significantly over time, even after the initial August 2013 Business Case was approved by the NSW Government but not made public. Therefore an Updated Business Case on an updated concept was published in 2015. SGS Economics and Planning undertook a detailed assessment of this and reached the following conclusions:
  - Misrepresentation of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) as 1.71 when it was 1.64.
  - The Business Case did not identify Stage 3 WestConnex, connecting the M4 to the M5, as a priority for "filling in the missing links in Sydney's motorway network".
  - Modelling for post-2031 conditions was not undertaken, however benefits were assumed to continue until 2052.
  - The transport modelling is likely to have underestimated the impact of extra traffic induced by the additional capacity, which would significantly reduce the BCR.
  - The Business Case did not reflect global approaches to congestion management, such as transit investment and demand management.
  - The Business Case suggested WestConnex would help renew Parramatta Road by reducing traffic on it, despite the modelling showing that many parts of it would carry more traffic, not less.
  - Travel time savings are a key component of the positive BCR. A significant proportion of these supposed benefits arise from travel time savings were within the margin of error of modelling, or would be so small that motorists may not notice them (and therefore would not value them).
  - Insufficient justification was provided for the significant travel time savings, and economic benefits, factored into the BCR for business and light commercial vehicles – for instance there was insufficient analysis of origins and destinations of these trips.
  - The construction costs appear too conservative – if these increase, the BCR would reduce accordingly.
  - Other costs were not accounted for, such as reduced amenity on urban development, loss of land for higher value activities, and the health costs of potentially reduced public transport use.
  - In summary, SGS suggested that the actual BCR of the project could be less than 1:1, with NSW taxpayers exposed to the risk that the project may not succeed.
- ◊ The project fails to address its most fundamental objective of connecting to Port Botany, the genesis of the entire enterprise

---

**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 KATIE Email \_\_\_\_\_ Mobile \_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Attention Director<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>Wenell Mooney</u>   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Address: <u>3/232c Glebe P + Rd</u>  |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Suburb: <u>Glebe</u> Postcode <u>2037</u><br>Signature: <u>Wenell Mooney</u> |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 (following 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: Natasha Zeremes   |
|   | Address: 89 Francis St  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 240.  |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature:  |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 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.
3. The impacts in the EIS are misleading because they do not include any detail of the cumulative impact caused by the overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 (of up to one year). 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 multiple WestConnex projects. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure. Nor does the EIS provide for any traffic management to prevent rat running during the period of construction, when Stages 1 and 2 have opened. The EIS should not be approved without this detail and adequate plans to manage this impact.
4. 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)
5. The EIS states that all vegetation on the Darley Road site will be removed. This includes a mature large tree which provides a visual and noise barrier from the City West Link. The tree should not be permitted to be removed.
6. Despite the fact the EIS identifies over 30 homes with severe noise impacts, no mitigation is mandated. While the possibility of noise walls is flagged, along with in-home treatments, none of this is a requirement. Nor is any detail provided on which residents or business owners can comment. 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Natasha Zeremes</u>                     |
|   | Address: <u>89 Francis St</u>                    |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040 -</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <u>NZ</u>                             |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Natasha Zeremes</u>                   |
|   | Address: <u>89 Francis St</u>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2040</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <u>NZ</u>                           |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. 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. The EIS does not mention that 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <u>Natasha Zeremes</u>                   |
|   | Address: <u>89 Francis St</u>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <u>Leichhardt</u> Postcode <u>2016</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <u>NZ</u>                           |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. I object 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.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically provide that all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
4. 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.
5. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed or any detail provided. 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 uninhabitable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
6. The EIS does not even 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <i>Natasha Zeremes</i>                   |
|   | Address: <i>89 Francis St</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>Leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>NZ</i>                           |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. The period of construction proposed is unacceptably long. Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years while the EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This period creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.
3. 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. The EIS states 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.
4. No truck movements should be permitted on Darley Rd or any local roads in Leichhardt or adjoining suburbs. 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 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. I object to the selection of the Darley Rd site altogether, but propose this alternative, which appears to represent the least worst impact, should be chosen if this site is to be used.
5. I object to the number of truck movements proposed at the Darley Road site. The EIS states that there will be 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, as is currently provided.
6. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets and provide a plan for enforcement (to be paid for by SMC and not by the Inner West Council).

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <i>Natasha Zeremes</i>                   |
|   | Address: <i>89 Francis St</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>leichhardt</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>NZ</i>                           |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 has many caveats and depends upon further steps (such as traffic management plans), the detail of which is not provided. The community has no certainty that any of the impacts from construction will be managed to an acceptable level.
3. 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.
4. 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)
5. 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)
6. There are 36 homes identified as having severe noise impacts during construction in Leichhardt and Lilyfield. No noise barriers have been identified so residents are unable to comment as to whether this impact will be reduced. No proposal for alternative accommodation is provided. This is unacceptable and all of the proposed noise mitigation options should be detailed in the EIS so that residents have an opportunity to comment on what is proposed. (Executive Summary xvii)
7. There is no plan to manage traffic on Darley Road proposed in the EIS. This critical arterial road is regularly congested at peak periods. Reference in the EIS to developing a traffic management plan in the future is not acceptable. The detail of what is proposed needs to be contained in the EIS so that residents can assess whether the impact of 170 light and heavy vehicle movements a day in and out of the site can be acceptably managed.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: Natasha Zeremes            |
|  | Address: 89 Francis St           |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode 2040 |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: NZS009                |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 as it will create unacceptable noise impacts for the community and lead to traffic chaos, along with creating an increased risk of accidents to pedestrians and cycle users.
2. The substation and water treatment plant proposed for Darley Road should be moved to the north end of the site near the City West link so that it is less visible to residents. 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. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in 'exceptional circumstances', which includes queuing at the site. Given the acknowledged constraints of the Darley Rd 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, as pertains to the Darley Road site, needs to be amended to rule out queuing as an exceptional circumstance which allows trucks to use local roads.
4. At the conclusion of the construction period, the Darley Road 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 approval conditions need to mandate that the Darley Rd site is to be preserved as green space or other community purposes at the conclusion of the construction period.
5. No trucks (heavy or light) should be permitted on any streets adjacent to Darley Road identified as NCA 13 (James Street to Falls Street). A blanket prohibition should be in force with respect to any worker vehicles from the construction site parking on these local streets. These homes will already suffer the worst construction impacts and should be spared the further imposition of lack of parking and the additional noise impacts of additional cars on their street. These local streets are not designed to handle heavy vehicle movements. Therefore, any approval conditions need to prohibit outright truck movements (including parking) and worker parking on all local streets adjacent to Darley Road.
6. Any approval conditions and the relevant construction contracts must require that all workers to the Darley Rd site are bussed in or use public transport such as the light rail, with no parking whatsoever permitted on local roads adjacent to the Darley Road site. The site currently provides only 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.

**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: Jackson Turner  | Suburb Glebe |
| Address: Unit 4, 1 cook street<br>Post Code 2037  |              |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No |              |
| Declaration: I have not made any reportable political donations in the last 2 years.  |              |
| Signed:    | Date 1/10/17 |

- Traffic and transport – new right hand turning lane on the City West Link to James St**

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because the proponent is planning to create a right hand turning lane on the City West Link to allow construction vehicles to turn right into James Street.

This is a dangerous proposal given that it involves turning into a steep blind corner which carries a high degree of risk of collision with oncoming vehicles and with pedestrians including the many school children who cross James St at this point.

It is reckless beyond belief to plan for large number of truck and dogs to make a right-hand turn into James St from the City West Link. Even vehicles crossing the City West Link from the Lilyfield Rd side of the City West Link have a higher risk of collision or error due to the steep blind turn. This would be even higher when making a right hand turn into James St from the City West Link.

This intersection is reported as being the third most dangerous for accidents in the Inner West.

I object to the Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Darley Road Leichhardt because a right hand turning lane on the City West Link to allow construction vehicles to turn right into James Street creates an unacceptable risk of death and bodily injury due to collision.

The proponent should be required to abandon the Darley Road civil and tunnel site Leichhardt. Safer alternatives have been identified which will allow spoil haulage directly onto the City West Link and the proponent has not given an adequate explanation as to why these alternatives have not been included in the EIS.

- Traffic lanes on the southern side of Darley Street would be relocated onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- The proposed kerbside traffic lane on the southern side of Darley Street would conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures. Significant drainage works would be required to address this issue without exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.

Advice from the RTA has also noted the unsuitability of the existing kerbside parking and bicycle lanes for a through lane due to its cross-fall. The RTA have further advised that the bicycle lane along Darley Road must be retained, and that no objections are raised to the proposed pedestrian refuge, subject to compliance with the relevant Australian standards. "The RTA also raised objections in relation to traffic that the bottle shop development would generate:

"It is expected that the peak traffic generation periods for the development would be Friday evenings and Saturdays, with Thursday evening also busy. Conflict with the morning peak hour is therefore expected to be limited. It is noted that the traffic surveys were conducted prior to the closure of Moore Street West, Leichhardt.

Anecdotal evidence has suggested that traffic flow has increased on east-west thoroughfares such as Darley Road and Marion Street since the closure.

Traffic generation figures supplied in the traffic report initially submitted to Council were derived strictly from the amount of carparking provided on the site.

The revised traffic generation figures provided as a result of the additional parking provided on the site. It has factored that 35% of traffic to the site are passing trips. It has not accounted for spill-over traffic that cannot be accommodated on the site.

These figures would appear to conflict with statement within the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) that was submitted to the LAB for approval. This document indicates that the 'catchment' for the proposed liquor outlet is considerably larger and it states "In contrast Dan Murphy's OLR's are larger format destination stores designed to appeal to a regional market ..."

It has also been noted that the proposed liquor store alone would expect up to sixty (60) deliveries a week.

The study derives that the likely additional traffic on the local network would be:

- Thursday evening – some 150 vehicles/hour (in + out)
- Friday evening - some 156 vehicles/hour (in + out)
- midday - some 228 vehicles/hour (in + out)

Of particular concern in this regard is that the 'No stopping' restriction required by the RTA for the northern side of Darley Road during the Thursday and Friday evening peaks, which may funnel overflow parking into the surrounding residential streets. Furthermore, the substantial increase in traffic flow at the Saturday peak may result in significant queuing at the City-West intersection as all vehicles are forced to left-turn exiting the site.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered unsatisfactory when having regard to traffic and parking impacts."

It is clear that the same traffic impacts raised by the RTA will be a consequence of the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these. The proponent's plan to bring 100 trucks a day into the site will result in significant queuing at the City-West intersection yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these.

The removal of 20 parking spaces Darley Rd and the absence of a worker parking plan will funnel overflow parking into the surrounding residential streets which are already at parking capacity yet the proponent has failed to provide any detail about these impacts or how the proponent will manage these.

The following points of concern were also raised in the Council's rejection of the bottle shop DA:

"Traffic and parking impact on Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network/ vehicular – pedestrian conflict, especially with school children/ increase noise from traffic movements and truck loading and unloading.

The increase in traffic movements to the site are likely to have an undue acoustic impact on the dwellings located opposite site, particularly as a result of late-night movements.

The proponent has failed to adequately address the fact that the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt will have the same impacts of:

- Traffic and parking impact on Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network
- vehicular – pedestrian conflict, especially with school children/
- increase noise from traffic movements and truck loading and unloading.

The proponent has failed to address the fact that the increase in traffic movements to the site are likely to have an undue acoustic impact on the dwellings located opposite site, particularly as a result of late-night movements. The proponent plans to have workers on site 24 / 7. Late night and out of hours comings and goings by vehicle are to be expected yet the proponent has failed to address the impact of these vehicle movements on local residents.

**The site should not be permitted to operate outside of standard constructions hours because of the noise impacts from construction vehicles, delivery vehicles and worker transportation vehicles.** The following Traffic Management deficiencies were also raised in the Council's rejection of the bottle shop DA:

"The proposed Traffic Management works on the Darley Road frontage have a number of deficiencies including:

- (a) Traffic lanes on the southern side of Darley Road would be relocated onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- (b) The proposed kerbside traffic lane on the southern side of Darley Road would conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures. Significant drainage works would be required to address this issue without exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.

- (c) The access arrangement for the parking area on the western side of the site will create traffic conflict at the shared entry/exit driveway near Hubert Street.
- (d) The application would result in the loss of on-street parking spaces on the southern side of Darley Road.
- (e) The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the traffic management proposal complies with the RTA requirements for works on a State Road.
- (f) The site plans do not adequately address internal vehicle manoeuvring for large trucks accessing the 2 loading docks.
- (g) The application has failed to demonstrate how the existing bicycle lane would be maintained.

The application has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an undue increase in traffic

generation along Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network.

- (a) The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated assumptions made in their report regarding parking demand and traffic generation.
- (b) The traffic generation assumption for passing or redistributed trips is not validated.
- (c) The design does not adequately address the impacts from vehicle queuing in Darley Road."

The same deficiencies are present in the proponent's EIS and the Darley Road Civil and Tunnel Construction site at Leichhardt should be rejected on the same grounds:

- construction trucks travelling on the southern side of Darley Road will force traffic onto the existing parking lane which is geometrically unsuitable and unsafe for vehicular traffic.
- the construction works will conflict with existing stormwater drainage inlet structures which will exacerbating existing flooding problems in this area.
- The access arrangement for the site will create traffic conflict at the shared entry/exit driveway near Hubert Street.
- The application would result in the loss of on-street parking spaces on the southern side of Darley Road.
- There is no traffic management proposal.
- The proponent has failed to demonstrate how the existing bicycle lane would be maintained.
- The proponent has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an undue increase in traffic generation along Darley Road and the surrounding residential street network.
- The proponent has failed to adequately address the impacts from vehicle queuing in Darley Road."

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: Sam Worrall

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: 4/65-67 Castle St

~~Leichhardt~~ NSW

Suburb: Leichhardt

Postcode: 2040

This document is vague, lacking in detail confusing and confused. Here are my objections:

1. 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 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.
2. 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**.
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 27 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 sustain serious structural damage and cracking.
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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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**" children will be unaware that they are being poisoned.
9. 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 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**.

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

Name: FIZAN G ISLAM ALCAZAR  
Signature: J. Islam

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: 83 HORDERN ST.

Suburb: NEW TOWN 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


Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link

- o 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.
- o The process that has led to this EIS has been undemocratic and obscure, driven by decisions made behind closed doors.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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 ?
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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?
- o 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).
- o Other Comments :

---

**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 \_\_\_\_\_

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Submission to : Planning Services,<br/>Department of Planning and Environment<br/>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Attention: Director – Transport Assessments</p> <p>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application<br/>Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> | <p>Name: [REDACTED]</p> <p>Signature: </p> <p><i>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></p> <p>Address: [REDACTED]</p> <p>Suburb: [REDACTED] Postcode [REDACTED]</p> |
|---|---|

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 \_\_\_\_\_

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Submission to : Planning Services,<br/>Department of Planning and Environment<br/>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p><b>Attention: Director – Transport Assessments</b></p> <p>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application<br/>Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> | <p>Name: [REDACTED]</p> <p>Signature: [REDACTED]</p> <p><i>[Handwritten signature]</i></p> <p><i>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></p> <p>Address: [REDACTED]</p> <p>Suburb: [REDACTED] Postcode [REDACTED]</p> |
|--|---|

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

- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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 ?
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o It is 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.
- o 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.
- o 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 \_\_\_\_\_

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Attention Director</b><br/>Application Number: SSI 7485 Application</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br/>Department of Planning and Environment<br/>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001</p> <p>Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link</p> | <p>Name: [REDACTED] .....</p> <p>Signature: [REDACTED]</p> <p>Please include /<u>delete</u> (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.</p> <p>Address: [REDACTED]</p> <p>Suburb: [REDACTED] Postcode [REDACTED]</p> |
|--|---|

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

- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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 original objectives of the project specified improving road and freight access to Sydney Airport and to Port Botany. Neither Stage 2 or 3 provides such access. 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Unfiltered stacks anywhere in Sydney are not unacceptable. There must be a review of the NSW government's unacceptable policy on this issue. I am appalled that the ex Minister for Planning Rob Stokes who approved the New M5 and unfiltered stacks in St Peters and Haberfield would declare that he would not have them in his own area. How can residents have any trust in a process that is underpinned by such hypocrisy.
- ❖ 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>HAZEL SYKES</i>                       |
|  | Address: <i>87 FRANCIS ST</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link   | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>                  |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Hazel Steen</i>                       |
|  | Address: <i>87 FRANCIS ST</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>                  |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 be 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <u>HAZEL SYRON</u>                            |
|  | Address: <u>87 Francis St</u>                       |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <u>CENTRAL HARBOUR</u> Postcode <u>2000</u> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <u>Hazel Syron</u>                       |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 (following 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <i>Hazel Stark</i>                       |
|   | Address: <i>87 FRANCIS St</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>                  |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

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 (following 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Hazel Syron</i>        |                      |
|  | Address: <i>8188 Francis St</i> |                      |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i>       | Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>   |                      |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>PO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <i>Hazel Sykes</i>                       |
|  | Address: <i>87 FRANCIS ST</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>                  |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001  | Name: <i>HAZEL Syson</i>                       |
|   | Address: <i>87 Farans St</i>                   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>                  |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:

1. I object to the selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. The period of construction proposed is unacceptably long. Leichhardt residents were repeatedly told by SMC that the Darley Road site would be operational for three years while the EIS states that it will be operational for 5 years. This period creates an unacceptable impact for residents. The works on the site should be restricted to a three-year program as was promised.
3. 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. The EIS states 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.
4. No truck movements should be permitted on Darley Rd or any local roads in Leichhardt or adjoining suburbs. 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 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. I object to the selection of the Darley Rd site altogether, but propose this alternative, which appears to represent the least worst impact, should be chosen if this site is to be used.
5. I object to the number of truck movements proposed at the Darley Road site. The EIS states that there will be 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, as is currently provided.
6. No workers associated with the WestConnex project should be permitted to park on local streets. Parking is at a premium in this area and many residents do not have off-street parking. The removal of 20 car spaces for five years as is proposed on Darley Road will worsen this situation as will the removal of 'kiss and ride facilities' at the light rail. There is also a pre-DA application for 120 units on William Street which is not taken into account in the EIS. This will place further stress on parking. The EIS needs to outright prohibit any worker parking on local streets and provide a plan for enforcement (to be paid for by SMC and not by the Inner West Council).

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>Karen Syron</i>                       |
|  | Address: <i>87 FRANCIS St</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link  | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>                  |
| Please <u>include</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 selection of Darley Road as a civil and construction site on the following grounds.
2. I object to the proposal that 170 heavy and light vehicle movements a day will occur at this site. This will create an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and bicycle users. 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. The EIS does not mention that 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: <i>HAZEL SYLVEON</i>                      |
|   | Address: <i>87 Farmers St</i>                   |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>LEITCHMAGOT</i> Postcode <i>2090</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i>                   |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 further object to the proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. 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 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.
3. The impacts in the EIS are misleading because they do not include any detail of the cumulative impact caused by the overlaps in the construction periods of the New M5 and M4 (of up to one year). 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 multiple WestConnex projects. The EIS makes no attempt to measure or mitigate the cumulative impact of these prolonged periods of construction noise exposure. Nor does the EIS provide for any traffic management to prevent rat running during the period of construction, when Stages 1 and 2 have opened. The EIS should not be approved without this detail and adequate plans to manage this impact.
4. 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)
5. The EIS states that all vegetation on the Darley Road site will be removed. This includes a mature large tree which provides a visual and noise barrier from the City West Link. The tree should not be permitted to be removed.
6. Despite the fact the EIS identifies over 30 homes with severe noise impacts, no mitigation is mandated. While the possibility of noise walls is flagged, along with in-home treatments, none of this is a requirement. Nor is any detail provided on which residents or business owners can comment. 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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>HARER SYON</i>       |                      |
|  | Address: <i>87 FRANCIS St</i> |                      |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i>     | Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link   | Signature: <i>[Signature]</i> |                      |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001                                    | Name: <i>Hazel Sykes'</i>                      |
|   | Address: <i>87 FRANCIS St</i>                  |
| Application Number: SSI 7485  | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i> Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5 Link   | Signature: <i>[Handwritten Signature]</i>      |
| Please include my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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 proposal to the Darley Road civil and tunnel site for the reasons set out in this submission.
2. I object 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.
3. The EIS permits trucks to access local roads in exceptional circumstances which includes queuing at the site. Given the constraints of the Darley Road site queuing will be the usual situation. The EIS needs to be amended to remove queuing as an exceptional circumstance. The truck movements should properly managed by the contractor so that there is no queuing. This exception will make it easier for contractors to neglect their obligation to monitor and manage truck movements in and out of the site and needs to be removed. The EIS needs to specifically provide that all local streets abutting Darley Road and expressly prohibited truck movements (including parking) on these streets. This should include all streets from the north (James St) to the south (Falls Road), which are near the project footprint.
4. 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.
5. The EIS states that construction noise levels would exceed the relevant goals without additional mitigation. The additional mitigation is mentioned but not proposed or any detail provided. 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 uninhabitable during this period. In addition, the planned 170 heavy and light vehicles will considerably worsen the impact of construction noise.
6. The EIS does not even 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.

---

**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<br>Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services,<br>Department of Planning and Environment<br>GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW, 2001   | Name: <i>HAZEL SYEON</i>                  |                      |
|  | Address: <i>87 FRANCIS ST</i>             |                      |
| Application Number: SSI 7485   | Suburb: <i>LEICHHARDT</i>                 | Postcode <i>2040</i> |
| Application Name: WestConnex M4-M5<br>Link   | Signature: <i>[Handwritten Signature]</i> |                      |
| Please <u>INCLUDE</u> my personal information when publishing this submission to your website<br>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:..... Anne M BURLEN

Signature:..... A. M. BURLEN

*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:..... 37 CURTS RD

Suburb: ..... BALMAIN Postcode 2041

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 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.
- B. 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.
- C. 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.
- D. I am concerned that the EIS provides no reasons why the City of Sydney's alternative plan might not be preferable to the proposed WestCONnex.
- 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. 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.