

Director, Transport Assessments Planning Services  
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney, NSW 2001

**Application: SSI 7485**

Dear Director Transport Assessments Planning Services,

I write regarding the proposed modification to M4-M5 Link, Mod 2 The Crescent overpass and changes to pedestrian infrastructure in North Annandale, Rozelle and Rozelle Bay Foreshore area. *I object to the overpass & the relocation of the GreenLink, and*  
I request RMS work with the community to explore alternate design options to the proposed new car overpass design and the changed pedestrian and cyclist links. I am seeking the reinstatement of the safe, direct access from the approved EIS GreenLink to create a continuous green open space connection from the Rozelle Rail yards and Annandale to the foreshore. The GreenLink was more than just a walk way - it put people central to the design, maximising safety, and providing much needed accessible open space for the community now and into the future Bays Precinct design.


I am requesting RMS put people back into the plan - we want you to reinstate your own vision as laid out in Transport for NSW Future Strategy 2056. Work with us to design a feasible option that brings the best elements from the approved EIS design into the modification.

My key concerns with the M4-M5 Modification are:

- The significantly reduced safety and increased risk for pedestrians and cyclists with removed access over The Crescent to Bicentennial Park and the increased traffic along Johnson Street.
- Being required to cross five sets of pedestrian lights at The Crescent as my option to reach the foreshore from Annandale or from Rozelle Bay light rail stop.
- Removal of direct active links to the foreshore, cutting the community off from the area and the proposed revitalisation of the entire Bays Precinct, including linking the Light Rail and Bus stops to a Ferry wharf and Metro station.
- Urban and landscape design that is being built before a finalised Masterplan for the area.
- Traffic changes that limit movements around the suburb and create further congestion in the local streets of Annandale, Forest Lodge, Glebe, Lilyfield and Rozelle with no planning to deal with these.

Alongside these issues my other concerns include:

*Please find Attached Page.*

*Signed :* 



6

[REDACTED]



- I am concerned about the negative visual impact that the concrete overpass and stream of traffic will have on the area, blocking as they will views of natural greenery and water, modest though they be as compared to views available on the northern side of the harbour. Annandale is a small neighbourhood, and there is intimacy in and between its streets and the parklands of Rozelle Bay, which will be destroyed by the proposed Overpass.
- I am concerned about the loss of the small park on the corner of The Crescent and the City West Link.
- I am concerned about the lack of communication and consultation with the community about these modifications to the M4-M5 Link including the proposed new Overpass.
- I am concerned about an Approval process that allows major changes to be made once approval has been granted for the project. This happens often with big corporations while small building projects are not allowed to make such modifications.

Further to this point, I read in the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Guidance Series June 2017 - "Changes to approved projects are sometimes necessary and it is important that circumstances under which project change can occur **is understood by all stakeholders.**"

I would say that we who live in the neighbourhood, as stakeholders, do not understand why these changes are necessary and why other solutions can't be found that are equally effective for traffic movement but are not destructive to the local community and area.

In the same document I read, "For SSD, State Significant Development, a proponent must demonstrate that the change, if carried out, would result in a development that would be substantially the same development as the original development. ... the modified development is "essentially or materially" the same.

By "Substantially" is meant "essentially or materially", "having the same essence."

In my understanding the proposed Overpass and other Modifications do not fit this requirement as they are both materially and "in essence" different from what was approved in 2017.

Further to this, I read, "A modification cannot change an "underlying and essential" component of the approval." Again, I do not understand how once approval is given such modifications as are being proposed can be made.

Signed :

[Redacted Signature]