Application Number SSI 7485 WestConnex M4-M5 Link – Modification 2 The Crescent overpass

Sandra Guy Paddington

Firstly, the online portal on the DP&E website was faulty and I was unable to verify my details after I created an account. The verification failed - and the link in the email could only be used once. I have spoken to friends who had similar problems. In attempting to started from scratch your portal indicated my email had already been used to create an account but I was unable to log in because I had not been able to verify my details.

For valid public consultation, I would have thought the department could at least set up a user-friendly method of receiving submissions - by email, for example - anticipating technical problems such as this.

I have numerous objections to the proposed change at Annandale/Rozelle – which will change an unobtrusive underground tunnel to an unnecessary and visually offensive flyover that will have enormous visual impact. It should not be approved.

1. The overpass is unnecessary - the approved underpass has none of the drawbacks of the newly proposed overpass.

The overpass will be extremely visually offensive. The Cahill Expressway, all over again.
The additional traffic noise will have significant impact on the amenity of the surrounding area - especially on people using the local parks for passive recreation.

4. It has also been shown that additional urban background noise such as that produced by high volumes of traffic has a detrimental affect on many species of wildlife.

5. It will introduce more light into the area and studies have shown that artificial lights have a detrimental effect on many nocturnal species of wildlife (especially microbats) - interfering with natural behaviour patterns including hunting and mating and increasing predation leading to a drop in (or disappearance of) the local population.

6. The removal of the Buruwan Park trees (70 in total) - especially the mature figs, will have a significant impact on wildlife, removing habitat and food sources – already scarce in the city.

7. The age of the trees being removed is also significant. There is no 'short cut' to old trees and planting numerous young trees to replace an old tree is not 'like for like'. There is no 'like for like' when an old tree is removed. Over 300 wildlife species require tree hollows at some or all stages of their life cycle and it is only old trees that have the hollows and/or splits that provide shelter for animals such as powerful owls, possums, microbats and many other species. Removal of hollows is listed as a key threatening process for many of the listed threatened species that are found in Sydney.

7. It will cause difficulties for pedestrian access to Jubilee Park - especially for people with physical disabilities.

8. It will remove a segment of the green corridor linking local parks and green spaces - again impacting numerous species of wildlife.

9. The removal of public green space and increasing background noise goes against two of the basic concepts of creating liveable cities.

10. The proposed flyover is in direct contravention of many Objectives identified by Greater Sydney Commission (GSC) required to meet their Ten Key Directions. It is contradictory that while one agency is adopting objectives to assist planning decisions across greater Sydney to make it more liveable, productive and sustainable, that another key government agency would allow design changes on a major project that directly contravene those objectives. In fact, adopting this design change would be in direct contravention of GSC Objective 39 which identifies a collaborative approach to planning as the only way implementation of this vision for Sydney can occur.

The following key directions, indicators and objectives (in blue text) are stated as desirable by the Greater Sydney Commission and the proposed modification is in direct contravention of those objectives.

Key Directions of the Greater Sydney Commission -

Key Direction 8 - Valuing green space and landscape - indicated by increasing the urban tree canopy and expanding the Greater Sydney Green Grid. <u>Removing parkland and trees is</u> <u>obviously decreasing the urban tree canopy, not increasing it.</u> <u>Similarly, removing this</u> <u>particular parkland would result in a fragmentation of the Green Grid, rather than an expansion</u>.

Objective 27

Biodiversity is protected, urban bushland and remnant vegetation is enhanced. <u>This</u> proposed design change will harm biodiversity and destroy a vital section or urban bushland.

Objective 28

Scenic landscapes are protected. <u>This proposed flyover will destroy the scenic amenity of the area</u>.

Objective 30

Urban tree canopy cover is increased - This proposal will decrease the urban tree canopy.

Objective 31

Public open space is accessible, protected and enhanced - <u>This proposal will make public</u> open space less accessible and destroy it, not protect or enhance it.

Objective 32

The Green Grid links parks, open spaces, bushland and walking and cycling paths - <u>This</u> proposal removes a link in an existing green corridor.

Key Direction 10 - A resilient city - Adapting to a changing world

Objective 38 - Heatwaves and extreme heat are managed. <u>The reduction of green space</u> and the removal of tree canopy, especially mature trees that provide deep shade increases the effect of heatwaves and extreme heat.

Implementation of the Key Directions.

Objective 39 - A collaborative approach to city planning. <u>This proposed design change is in</u> conflict with so many of the stated objectives of the GSC that it cannot be said to be a collaborative approach to planning.

In summary, the new design should be refused.

Thank you.