



26 June 2019

Mary Garland
Transport Assessments
Department of Planning and Environment
Sydney
NSW 2000

Dear Mary

**F6 Extension Stage 1 New M5 Arncliffe to President Avenue, Kogarah (SSI-8931)
Response to Submissions on Preferred Infrastructure Report**

Thank you for your letter of 21 May 2019 requesting Roads and Maritime Services provides a response to the issues raised in relation to the Preferred Infrastructure Report. In response, please refer to the attachment to this letter.

For more information, please contact Chris Gorman F6 Approvals Manager on [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely

Vladimir Shopov
F6 Extension Project Director

Attachment A – response to submissions on the Preferred Infrastructure Report

1 Background

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared to support Roads and Maritime Service's (Roads and Maritime) application for approval of the project in accordance with the requirements of Part 5, division 5.2 of the EP&A Act. The EIS was placed on public exhibition by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) between 7 November and 14 December 2018). During this period 632 submissions were received by DPE. In accordance with the requirements for State significant infrastructure under section 5.17(6) of the EP&A Act, Roads and Maritime provided DPE with a response to the submissions on 17 April 2019 and these were made available for viewing online.

Based on community and stakeholder feedback received during the public exhibition, Roads and Maritime also prepared and displayed a Preferred Infrastructure Report (PIR). This report outlined proposed changes to the State significant infrastructure, to minimise its environmental impact and to address issues raised in submissions. The proposed changes were:

- President Avenue traffic and access changes
- Extension of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway.

The PIR was displayed between 17 April and 8 May 2019. During this exhibition period, interested stakeholders and members of the community were able to review project information online or at display locations and make a written submission to the DPE for consideration in its assessment of the project.

Consultation undertaken by Roads and Maritime in support of the PIR included:

- Provision of a community update brochure distributed to 46 000 properties between Arncliffe and Sans Souci
- Update of information on the project web page
- Provision of an information email to all stakeholders on the project database
- Door knocking surrounding homes to where changes are proposed.

This response presents a discussion of issues raised by the community and stakeholders associated with the preferred project changes as detailed in the PIR. Submissions which relate to the EIS and issues that have been raised previously and addressed in the Submissions Report have not been addressed in this response.

2 Analysis of the submissions

A total of 108 submissions were received from 108 submitters and registered by the Department of Planning and Environment. This included three submissions from government agencies and 105 submissions from community members and other interest groups. Of these 105 submissions, 28 unique submissions were provided, with the remaining 77 submissions being one of two form letters, referred to as form letter A and form letter B.

Form letter A raised three issues on the elements described within the PIR in addition to other issues previously raised in the EIS exhibition. The three issues were:

- The PIR exhibition duration and timing
- Traffic congestion resulting from the access changes on President Avenue and the resultant vehicle pollution
- Impacts to Patmore Swamp resulting from the extension of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway.

Form letter B raised no issues relevant to the elements described in the PIR.

Of the 28 unique submissions provided, 18 submissions were on issues associated with the preferred project changes as detailed in the PIR. The analysis of these submissions identified five main issues. In addition to the three issues noted above in form letter A, issues raised include:

- Extension of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway - additional connectivity issues
- President Avenue traffic and access changes - additional connectivity issues.

3 Response to issues raised on the Environmental Impact Statement and the F6 Stage 1 project

Submitters raised a number of concerns about the F6 Stage 1 project which are not relevant to the two changes detailed within the PIR. The particular concerns and where they were previously responded to in the Submissions Report related to:

- Project need and justification (responded to in section C3.2)
- Project funding and tolling (responded to in section C3.5)
- Strategic alternatives to the project, namely public transport (responded to in section C4.2)
- Health concerns during operation due to the ventilation outlets (responded to in section C9.5)
- Property impacts during construction (responded to in section C13.3).

The exhibited changes to the project are limited to the elements described in section 2.2 and 3.2 of the PIR. The above concerns raised have been addressed in the F6 Stage 1 project EIS and the Submissions Report. Refer to section 6 (Table 3) for breakdown of submissions made and the issues they raise.

4 Response to issues raised on Preferred Infrastructure Report

This section provides responses to issues raised in relation to two changes described in the PIR.

4.1 Extension of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway- impacts to Patmore Swamp

Issue

The main issue raised by respondents was regarding their concerns with the shared cyclist's and pedestrian pathway being extended south. Although the majority supported an extension of the route further south the key issue was that route should avoid impacting on Patmore Swamp. This was also raised by almost half of the 77 form submissions received. Specifically, submitters note that the ecological values (eg the threatened status of the

vegetation) and the swamps significance as a local heritage item have been ignored by Roads and Maritime and the proposed southern extension and the associated bridge and raised pathway embankment would destroy these values.

The submissions oppose the decision to situate the embankments of the pedestrian bridge within Patmore Swamp. The submissions contend that the assessment has not sufficiently considered the impact on vegetation communities and threatened species and has provided misleading or incorrect analysis of the impacts to the heritage values of Patmore Swamp. The extent of the swamp should accord with only the northern property lot (Lot 1 DP 1113262) contained within the Local Environment Plan (LEP) listing (Listing 202) and not to the portion that is within Scarborough Park. The submissions note they support the provision of an active transport route, however it should be to the east of the reserved corridor.

Also noted by two submissions is the impact the pathway would have on a memorial site located adjacent to the water body.

Response

The biodiversity assessment within EIS section 12.2.2 and section 3.4.4.2 of the PIR identified the vegetation impacted in Patmore Swamp as *Swamp Oak floodplain swamp forest, Sydney Basin Bioregion and South East Corner Bioregion* (plant community type (PCT) 1232) and *Common Reed on the margins of estuaries and brackish lagoons along the New South Wales coastline* (plant community type 1808). Refer to Figures 4-8 of the EIS Biodiversity Development Assessment Report and Figure 3.9 of the PIR. As noted in both of these reports, Swamp Oak Forest and Common Reed are both listed endangered ecological communities under schedule 2 of the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*. Also as noted in the PIR, the salinity of the waterbody is high, which confirms this is not regarded as *Sydney Freshwater Wetlands of the Sydney Basin Bioregion*, which is similar to the vegetation communities found within Patmore Swamp.

The cumulative area of impact to both these communities within the Patmore Swamp area from the proposed shared cycle and pedestrian pathway (as proposed within the EIS and the PIR) would be around 14,800 square metres (1.48 hectares). As detailed in the PIR, these impacts would require 18 biodiversity credits in total (for these community types alone) to be secured as a result of the project.

In relation to submissions that note an incorrect analysis of the impacts to the heritage values of Patmore Swamp, the reference to Patmore Swamp comes from the LEP (as responded to in section C5.3 of the Submissions Report). The LEP was the basis for the identification of a total area of around 262,000 square metres. However, it is acknowledged that the vegetation changes between the boundaries of the two property lots, due to the previous clearing and ongoing maintenance of the southern property lot in Scarborough Park. If Lot 1 DP 1113262 were only considered (which is around 182,000 square metres) to be representative of the native swamp vegetation, then around 13,700 square metres or around six percent of the property lot (Lot 1 DP 1113262) would be directly impacted by the project (pathway and President Avenue road widening embankment) as proposed in the EIS. The addition of the southern extension would affect an additional 3,000 square metres or nine percent in total. The extent that listed threatened vegetation would be impacted would be confirmed in detailed design, however it is estimated at a lesser value of around 5,000 square metres (0.5 hectares) would be directly impacted.

The PIR notes the local heritage significance of Patmore Swamp. Roads and Maritime maintains that the extension of the shared pathway has a potential to increase the awareness and aesthetic significance of the swamp, as assessed in the EIS.

As noted in the PIR the southern extension of the pathway is to be constructed largely on piers and on a boardwalk structure where it is at grade. These aspects will reduce the footprint of the infrastructure upon the vegetation. It would closely follow the existing network of grassed pathways. The biodiversity values present are modified and are already affected by human presence and frequent use including mowing and management of the track. The majority of the vegetation affected along the southern extension is managed grassed areas (Urban Native and Exotic Cover) with peripheral Common Reed vegetation and isolated trees. The detailed design and construction of the boardwalk pathway would aim to align with the existing maintained track areas so that impacts on areas of ecological sensitivity are avoided or minimised as much as possible.

The bridge embankments are where the most clearing would be required and the feature likely to result in the most permanent change to the swamp area. Roads and Maritime is committed to minimising the impact of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway and balancing the delivery of this important aspect of the project, with the least impact to heritage and biodiversity values. As noted in the EIS and restated in the PIR, the design and construction of the pathway will be required to minimise clearing and ensure exclusion areas are established that protect adjacent vegetation. A review of design aspects such as the alignment, bridge length, landing point and methods of constructing will be undertaken in detailed design to minimise potential impacts. Through the contracting tender process, Roads and Maritime will be seeking bridge and pathway designs that limit the footprint within threatened vegetation areas and require a method of building the bridge with the least impact to the threatened vegetation within the swamp.

More than six alignment options were investigated for the bridge crossing on the eastern side, and all options were constrained, either from an engineering or environmental perspective. As noted in some submissions, the route of the pathway on the western side of the corridor provides an opportunity to experience the values of the swamp without irreparably damaging those values. The alignment would open up opportunities for education and appreciation of the location for users of the shared pathway.

Roads and Maritime is aware of the memorial located at the edge of the Patmore Swamp waterbody and would consult with the family of the deceased with regards to its relocation.

Bayside Council requested Roads and Maritime look into options that extend the shared pathway further south and connect the eastern side of the corridor. This is identified in Chapter B7 of the Submissions Report.

Roads and Maritime notes that some submissions supported the pathway within this area given it will help formalise existing access routes, aiding protection of the area. They also noted it would provide greater permeability into local street areas and - provided the design gives appropriate consideration - would present educational opportunities of these resources.

4.2 Extension of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway - additional connectivity issues

Issue

A further extension of the route south was proposed within a few submissions, specifically noting Barton Street would be the preferred point of connection as it provides immediate east-west connectivity and links to pathways leading further south.

Response

An objective of the extension of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway is to link to existing pathways at Chuter Avenue, connecting it with the eastern side of the corridor. This provides more equitable access to residential areas in the east as well as the west. Access to areas substantially further south would be part of future stages of the F6 Extension and do not form scope for the F6 Extension Stage 1.

Issue

Submissions noted an objection to the proposed on-road section of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway, stating that it presents a safety risk to users and that the impacts of property acquisition required for an off-road cycleway are outweighed by the benefits that a contiguous shared pathway would provide. This was suggested in the submission from Bicycle NSW and Bike East, who are the main active transport stakeholders for the project.

Response

As per the response given in relation to this issue in Submissions Report (section B7.8.1), Roads and Maritime does not propose to initiate this off-road alignment at present, due to the existing constraints in the corridor.

4.3 President Avenue traffic and access changes - congestion on President Avenue

Issue

Respondents noted in submissions that the access changes into the Moorefield Estate would not provide benefits for traffic using President Avenue. Congestion along President Avenue would become worse, and the intersection with the Princes Highway would also be worse. One of the key concerns was that the extra traffic signals will cause more congestion. This was a key point raised within the form letter A submissions received and that this would be cause more vehicle emissions.

One submitter suggested that the tunnel exiting to a sunken roundabout at the President Avenue intersection would be a better solution than a signalised intersection as currently proposed.

Other concerns were that the changes will now further increase the traffic using and connecting to O'Connell Street and access to this street should be prevented.

Response

The President Avenue traffic and access changes are being proposed in response to concerns expressed by residents of Moorefield Estate. They reflect a balance between providing safe access into and out of the estate, and traffic flows along President Avenue. The PIR presented a traffic impact assessment in section 2.4.1. The introduction of the new traffic signals was assessed and demonstrated minimal changes compared to the EIS arrangement (+/- 1% or around 3 seconds delay per vehicle). Traffic volumes predicted in the EIS would not change; therefore overall emission levels along President Avenue are expected to stay the same as outlined in the EIS. These minimal changes to traffic movements would not affect vehicle emissions in any measureable sense.

Although the proposed PIR change would introduce additional signals along President Avenue, the signalisation of Civic Avenue would operate in conjunction with the existing West Botany Street intersection signals. This means they would operate under the one

signal control and Civic Avenue will mostly operate within the same phase of West Botany Street.

The proposed Lachal Avenue signals would only change the westbound President Avenue traffic flow, as eastbound traffic would not be affected by a stop line. These signals would operate only when a vehicle wants to turn right into Lachal Avenue and would only operate for short periods. All signals along President Avenue are co-ordinated by the Traffic Management Centre (TMC) to ensure traffic flow is maintained for all movements during peak flow traffic conditions.

Although, the traffic analysis (as detailed in tables 2-2 and 2-3 of the PIR) does predict very slight increased traffic flow delays as the result of the two additional traffic signals, the changes compared to the EIS design are minor. The results indicate good performance across all intersections in the AM and PM peak hours.

With regards to the suggestion that a roundabout could replace the intersection at President Avenue, these do not always work in such circumstances due to the dominant movement from the proposed motorway taking priority, at the expense of other traffic movements. This reduces the opportunity for minor movements to get an opportunity to enter the roundabout. Additionally, it would require substantial engineering to meet the level of flood immunity required. A roundabout would also require significant space at the intersection impacting residents and businesses and other established properties. It is therefore not a feasible option in this circumstance.

The project scope includes Local Area Traffic Management measures along O'Connell Street and Chuter Avenue from President Avenue to Ramsgate Road. The measures will consider implementing load limit signs, raised pedestrian crossings, speed humps etc. This would discourage long distance traffic along this route, and encourage these through movements to use the Princes Highway and The Grand Parade.

Through commitments Roads and Maritime have made as part of the project, traffic patterns and changes will be monitored and a reassessment made at the one year and five year interval following opening. This will consider any unforeseen issues that have arisen, including changes to the network.

4.4 President Avenue traffic and access changes - additional connectivity issues Issue

Respondents identified other traffic and access issues, particularly the safety of the Marshall Street intersection resulting from increased traffic from the project.

Submitters asked why no pedestrian link was provided on the northern side of President Avenue. This they say will mean a very convoluted and potentially dangerous route would need to be taken by pedestrians moving east-west through President Avenue.

Response

Roads and Maritime is aware of the concerns raised by the community. A review of crash data has not identified a high level of incidents at the Marshall Street/Rocky Point Road and Rocky Point Road/Princes Highway intersection and does not warrant specific action or concern in relation to the project. As noted in the Submissions Report, the project would not further decrease the safety of the intersection. A review of this intersection would be conducted as part of the Road Network Performance Review undertaken after project

opening. This review would be undertaken in consultation with Bayside Council. Refer to Submissions Report section B.7.11 and C7.3 for further details.

Whilst no pedestrian access is provided on the northern side of President Avenue, the project is providing a footpath on the southern side to maintain east-west connectivity. Pedestrians would be able to cross to the southern side via the pedestrian crossing at West Botany Street and then head east along President Avenue to Brighton Le-Sands. Access to Brighton Le-Sands School can be accessed via the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway from the northern side of President Avenue through Rockdale Bicentennial Park. Refer to Submissions Report section C5.3 for further details.

4.5 Timing of the request for submissions

Issue

A point made by some submitters was the timing of the release of the PIR. These contend that releasing the report during a holiday period was designed to receive less objections and the review period of three weeks did not allow sufficient time to properly consider the documentation. They note that this was also the case for the timing of the release of the EIS documentation to the public.

Response

The Planning Secretary of DPE is responsible for setting the timing and duration of public exhibition periods for documents relating to a State significant infrastructure project. The PIR was on exhibition for three weeks between the 17 April to 8 May 2019, including an extension of one week to the initial period due to requests by the public that it be made longer. This extension meant that there was one and a half weeks outside of the holiday period.

The PIR made two changes to the project that was exhibited within the EIS back in December 2018. These changes were not complex and were made in response to submissions received on the EIS. The PIR document was 46 pages in length and is not a large report.

5 Response to issues raised by Government agencies

Submissions on the PIR were received from Bayside Council, NSW Environment Protection Authority, and the NSW Department of Industry.

The Environment Protection Authority did not raise any issues relevant to the changes made in the PIR. The Environment Protection Authority submission raised a range of issues relevant to their area of responsibility. They provided a number of recommendations for conditions of approval for the preferred project that are with the DPE to consider. The NSW Department of Industry submission noted that they had no comments in relation to the PIR.

5.1 Bayside Council

The Bayside Council submission noted the following key points relating to the changes made in the PIR.

Issue

The PIR does not demonstrate or mention the provision and/or the length of a holding lane in President Avenue for traffic that turns right out of Civic Avenue. This holding lane is required to allow traffic from Civic Ave to merge safely with traffic travelling in President Avenue. Council request confirmation that this holding lane will be included as part of this project.

Response

The proposed arrangement discussed at the Local Traffic Workshop and presented to Bayside Council included a holding bay, to enable vehicles turning right from Civic Avenue to merge with potential eastbound traffic on President Avenue. This option was based on assumptions made in the operation of the new Civic Avenue intersection signals and the West Botany Street intersection signals. A further review of operation and safety identified an undesirable potential for a traffic conflict with this arrangement. As a result, the traffic signals have been modified to ensure that all movements are fully signal controlled and therefore a holding bay is not required.

Issue

Council request that Roads and Maritime work with Council and an independent accredited wetland ecologist to identify/peer review current and adjusted options which consider local biodiversity impacts as well as impacts on the habitat of Grey-Headed Flying Fox, Southern Myotis and the Green and Golden Bell Frog and impacts on the below Endangered Ecological Communities which Council has identified in this location:

- Sydney Freshwater Wetlands in the Sydney basin Bioregion
- Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest of the NSW North Coast, Sydney Basin and South East Bioregion

Council also requires information how the extension of this infrastructure in this area would meet the objectives of the relevant environmental legislation including NSW Coastal Management SEPP, *NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*, *NSW Fisheries Management Act 1994*.

Response

The biodiversity assessments undertaken for both the EIS and the PIR were prepared in accordance with the requirements of the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* (s. 6.12), *Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017* (s 6.8) and *Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM)* as required by the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements. The assessments were prepared by an accredited assessor of the scheme and reviewed by three accredited assessors of the scheme.

As noted above, the assessments have identified the following impacts to the ecological communities as a result of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway and the offset credits required:

Table 2 Impact of shared cycle and pedestrian pathway on endangered ecological communities

Vegetation Name	Project impact (ha) - EIS	Project impact (ha) - PIR	Total area (ha)	Biodiversity offset credits
Swamp Oak Forest PCT 1232	0.47	0.02	0.49	8
Common Reed PCT 1808	0.77	0.22	0.99	10

Due to the high levels of salinity leaching into the waterbody from groundwater, the plant community type Sydney Freshwater Wetlands of the Sydney Basin Bioregion has not been found to be present at Patmore Swamp. For similar reasons, the waterbodies at Scarborough Park North are not suitable habitat for Green and Golden Bell Frog. Surveys for these species did not detect them as being present.

The Swamp Oak Forest patch within Patmore Swamp does provide roosting and foraging habitat for the Grey-Headed Flying Fox. The patch and surrounding waterbody may also provide habitat for the Southern Myotis, although neither species was detected during surveys.

However, assessments carried out on the three species noted by council concluded there would be no significant impact to these species from the project as described within the EIS.

Issue

The shared cycle and pedestrian pathway, when it is on ground, is to be provided as a separated five metre active transport corridor (three metres cycleway, 1.5 metres pedestrian path). When the path merges to a shared-use boardwalk, the boardwalk width is to be a minimum 3.6 metres in width (between handrails) as per Austroads recommendations for high-use boardwalks and elevated paths.

Response

The reason the boardwalk section of the pathway was designed at three meters was to limit the potential impact of the boardwalk on the threatened vegetation and aesthetic qualities of Patmore Swamp. The detailed design will review the detail of this pathway and determine the optimal design width, whilst considering the other factors such as limiting native tree removal.

Issue

To maximise the usability and functionality of this extension Council requests that this extension is extended from Robinson Street to Barton Street, Kogarah with the retention of the refuge and crossing point on Chuter Avenue/O'Connell Street at Robinson Street.

Response

An objective of the extension of the shared cycle and pedestrian pathway was to link to existing pathways at Chuter Avenue, connecting it with the eastern side of the corridor. This provides more equitable access to residential areas in the east as well as the west. Access to areas substantially further south would be part of future stages of the F6 Extension and does not form the scope for the F6 Extension Stage 1.

Issue

As there will be considerable use of northbound commuters leaving Chuter Avenue to start the northern direction of the path Council request the provision of a high quality entrance to this path.

Response

The suggestion to have a 'high-quality' intersection of the pathway with Chuter Avenue/O'Connell Street at Robinson Street is noted. Roads and Maritime would work with council on the specific aspect of this design during the detailed design refinements, to ensure it provides a suitable transition for users at this point.

Issue

Council request Roads and Maritime consider an amended design for the western connection to Civic Avenue/Annette Street to allow a clearer (more direct) east/west passage across the park and to the road network and links towards Kogarah town centre.

Response

Roads and Maritime note council concerns with the current location of the crossing at Civic Avenue/Annette Street. Again, Roads and Maritime would work with council on the specific aspect of this design during the detailed design refinements on the connection point to the road network at Annette Avenue.

6 Submitter identification table

The list of issues, together with where they are addressed in this response or where they were previously addressed in the Submissions Report, are provided in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2 Submission number and where issues are addressed in this response

Submission number	Where addressed
Traffic and transport – shared pathway impact on Patmore Swamp	
SE-54451, SE-54096, SE-54095, SE-54554, SE-54298, SE-53064, SE-54325, SE-54326, SE-54469, SE-54445, SE-53071, SE-53771, SE-53096, SE-54470, SE-54471, SE-54453, SE-53766, SE-53783, SE-53779, SE-54455, SE-53768, SE-53201, SE-54321, SE-53129, SE-54458, SE-53767, SE-60637, SE-60599, SE-60639, SE-60725, SE-60724, SE-60752, SE-60753, SE-54446, SE-54447, SE-54452, SE-54454, SE-60727, SE-60751, SE-60715, SE-60750, SE-54466, SE-60760, SE-54461	Section 4.1
Traffic and transport - Alternative connectivity options for shared pathway	
SE-54112, SE-53774, SE-54303, SE-53772, SE-54123, SE-54314	Section 4.1
Traffic and Transport - Access for traffic	
SE-54451, SE-54326, SE-54096, SE-54298, SE-53131, SE-53064, SE-54325, SE-53002, SE-54445, SE-53071, SE-53771, SE-53096,	Section 4.2
Traffic and Transport - Congestion	
SE-53052, SE-53131, SE-53064, SE-54325, SE-54469, SE-54445, SE-53071, SE-53771, SE-53096, SE-54470, SE-54471, SE-54453,	Section 4.3
Consultation - Timing of the request for submissions	
SE-54451, SE-54326, SE-54096, SE-53064, SE-54445, SE-53071, SE-53771, SE-53096, SE-54470, SE-54471, SE-54453, SE-53766, SE-53783, SE-53779, SE-54455, SE-53768, SE-53201, SE-54321, SE-53129, SE-54458, SE-53767, SE-60637, SE-60599, SE-60639, SE-60725, SE-60724, SE-60752, SE-60753, SE-54446, SE-54447, SE-54452, SE-54454, SE-60727, SE-60751, SE-60715, SE-60750, SE-54466, SE-60760, SE-54461	Section 4.5

Table 3 Submission number and where issues were addressed in Submissions Report

Submission number	Where addressed in Submissions Report
Assessment process	
SE-53766	Section C1.3
Project need and justification	
SE-53766, SE-53090, SE-53070, SE-53064, SE-53783, SE-53909, SE-54531, SE-53779, SE-54455, SE-54325, SE-53091, SE-53061, SE-53087, SE-53093, SE-53910, SE-53768, SE-53086, SE-53082, SE-53094, SE-53084, SE-53201, SE-54321, SE-53072, SE-53129, SE-53083, SE-54458, SE-53767, SE-54448	Section C3.2
Project funding and tolling	
SE-53077, SE-53076, SE-53092, SE-53079, SE-54445, SE-53071, SE-54468, SE-53060, SE-53069, SE-53771, SE-53089, SE-53066, SE-53095, SE-53080, SE-53074, SE-53096, SE-53062, SE-53078, SE-53086, SE-53082, SE-53094, SE-53084, SE-53072, SE-53083, SE-54448	Section C3.5
Future stages of the F6 Extension	
SE-54298, SE-53064, SE-53776, SE-53909	Section C3.7
Strategic alternatives to the project - Public transport	
SE-53909, SE-54451, SE-54096, SE-53075, SE-54470, SE-54471, SE-54453, SE-53766, SE-53090, SE-53070, SE-53783, SE-53909, SE-54531, SE-53779, SE-54455, SE-54325, SE-53091, SE-53061, SE-53087, SE-53093, SE-53910, SE-53768, SE-53086, SE-53082, SE-54303, SE-53094, SE-53084, SE-53201, SE-54321, SE-53072, SE-53129, SE-53083, SE-54458, SE-53767, SE-54448	Section C4.2
Parking impacts during operation	
SE-54451, SE-54470, SE-54471, SE-54453, SE-53766, SE-53090, SE-53070, SE-53783, SE-54531, SE-53779, SE-54455, SE-54325, SE-53091, SE-53061, SE-53087, SE-53093, SE-53910, SE-53768, SE-53086, SE-53082, SE-53094, SE-53084, SE-53201, SE-54321, SE-53072, SE-53129, SE-53083, SE-54458, SE-53767	Section C7.5
Local road impacts during operation	
SE-54451, SE-53096, SE-54470, SE-54471, SE-54453, SE-53766, SE-53090, SE-53070, SE-53783, SE-54531, SE-53779, SE-54455, SE-54325, SE-53091, SE-53061, SE-53087, SE-53093, SE-53910, SE-53768, SE-53086, SE-53082, SE-53094, SE-53084, SE-53201, SE-54321, SE-53072, SE-53129, SE-53083, SE-54458, SE-53767	Section C7.4
Operational air quality impacts	
SE-54451, SE-54470, SE-54471, SE-54453, SE-53766, SE-53090, SE-53070, SE-53783, SE-53909, SE-54531, SE-53779, SE-54455, SE-54325, SE-53091, SE-53061, SE-53087, SE-53093, SE-53910, SE-53768, SE-53086, SE-53082, SE-53094, SE-53084, SE-53201, SE-54321, SE-53072, SE-53129, SE-53083, SE-54458, SE-53767	Section C8.3
Human health impacts during operation	
SE-54451, SE-54470, SE-54471, SE-54453, SE-53766, SE-53090, SE-53070, SE-53783, SE-54531, SE-53779, SE-54455, SE-54325, SE-53091, SE-53061, SE-53087, SE-53093, SE-53910, SE-53768, SE-53086, SE-53082, SE-53094, SE-53084, SE-53201, SE-54321, SE-53072, SE-53129, SE-53083, SE-54458, SE-53767	Section C9.5

Submission number	Where addressed in Submissions Report
Property impacts during construction SE-54470,SE-54471,SE-54453,SE-53766,SE-53783,SE-54531,SE-53779,SE-54455,SE-54325,SE-53768,SE-53086,SE-53201,SE-54321,SE-53129,SE-54458,SE-53767	Section C13.3
Other Roads and Maritime projects and issues outside the scope of the project	
SE-53090,SE-53070,SE-54531,SE-53091,SE-53061,SE-53087,SE-53093,SE-53910,SE-53086,SE-53082,SE-53094,SE-53084,SE-53072,SE-53083	Section C23.1

