

Director,  
Major Project Assessments  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

**Submission: WestConnex M4 East EIS (SS6307)**

I wish to express my objection to the WestConnex M4 East motorway proposal. If built it will generate additional traffic funnelling into heavily congested middle-ring and inner city roads, requiring the demolition of homes and businesses to make way for road widening on the surface road network to distribute the traffic from the motorway.

I also wish to register my objection to the government awarding tenders for the project before a full business case has been publicly released and before the EIS (EIS) has been published and the public has exercised its right of participation.

The EIS process is supposed to allow for genuine public input and to result, potentially, in approval, non-approval, or approval with modifications, of project. The present procedure makes a mockery of that right.

Government funding for this proposal – as part of the whole WestConnex proposal – will claim an extraordinary proportion of the state transport budget for years to come. This being the case, I am in disbelief that the EIS has failed to honestly and fully discuss its social, environmental, and economic impacts or to explain why it is preferable to other, alternate public and active transport solutions.

In particular I draw attention to the EIS's failure to:

- Factor into the traffic modelling the very large increase in apartment construction and therefore of population, that has been promoted by the WestConnex Delivery Authority and other agencies as a major rationalisation for the proposal.
- Honestly discuss public transport and freight rail alternatives.
- Publish a robust business case to justify expenditure of billions of dollars' worth of taxpayers funds.
- Properly describe the long term impacts of air pollution generated by the increased traffic volumes the project is designed to facilitate.
- Consider more sustainable public and active transport options that will produce a lower level of greenhouse gas emissions.

Decades long global experience or urban motorway construction has demonstrated conclusively that big new urban roads are counterproductive. They generate a flood of new road traffic and rapidly reach capacity. This is why, globally, they have fallen out of favour and are no longer seen as a solution to congestion.

Furthermore, I wish to formally express my objection to the "M4 East" Extension on the following grounds:

1. The design “alignment” of the tunnel has evolved over a three (3) year period, where it was originally positioned on the Northern side of the existing M4 (bearing as defined in Figure 1.4 “Operational and Directional Descriptions”. In particular, in 2013 under the Government preferred route, it was closer to Carrington Street at North Strathfield, where in the current submission by the private constructor, it is positioned closer to Princess Avenue North Strathfield. The only logical reason provided for such a proposed location is that it is considerably more cost efficient to construct in this location.
2. Table 4.2 in section 4.3.2 “Tunnel Corridor Options” (Volume 1A) looks at the advantages and disadvantages of the tunnel corridor options:

**Table 4.2 Advantages and disadvantages of tunnel corridor options**

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Following Parramatta Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts of tunnelling would occur beneath commercial and industrial properties</li> <li>• Ground conditions are expected to be suitable for tunnelling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tunnels below Parramatta Road would restrict the depths to which buildings could be constructed, in particular basements or footings for taller buildings</li> <li>• This would restrict opportunities for urban revitalisation and improved liveability along and around Parramatta Road.</li> </ul>
North of Parramatta Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tunnels would be shorter, which would reduce construction cost</li> <li>• Tunnels would not cross beneath Parramatta Road, preserving the corridor for future urban renewal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ground conditions are expected to be unsuitable for tunnelling, because of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Less stable rock</li> <li>– Higher groundwater inflows</li> <li>– Landfilling that has historically occurred in a number of areas including near Concord Oval.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Generally south of Parramatta Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tunnels would be shorter, which would reduce construction cost</li> <li>• Tunnels would only cross beneath Parramatta Road for a short distance, preserving the majority of the corridor for future urban renewal</li> <li>• Ground conditions are expected to be favourable for tunnelling, which would allow for quicker construction and lower risks associated with tunnelling activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts of tunnelling would occur beneath residential properties.</li> </ul>

Based on the EIS, it states that “generally to the south of Parramatta Road was preferred as ground conditions are generally considered better, which would allow for quicker construction and lower risk associated with tunnelling activities. This option would also result in a shorter tunnel length, which would in turn reduce construction cost”.

The above statement contradicts the current alignment as it is on the Northern side of Parramatta Road and the existing M4. The table also states that the tunnel on the North of Parramatta Road would also be in less stable rock and pass through areas of historic landfilling.

3. Section 4.4.1 “Western Tunnel Portals” (Volume 1A), the preferred option is H3, which states it is preferred as it will not limit any future development potential at Railway Lane and George Street. Based on this, the current alignment has the potential to limit the development potential to our property in future rezone to a higher density than the current “R3”. The property is in an area that would historically be rezoned to higher density development as it lies on a main train line and within the expected growth corridor.
4. There is a bias in the EIS to favour properties that have already had development consent for residential development opposed to privately owned land with development potential. Coincidentally, there are a number of properties along Parramatta Road, from Bridge Road Homebush to Concord Road North Strathfield, that have already had development consent and have started construction. It is therefore evident that due to the considerable costs that would be incurred by the Government for the acquisition of this land or loss of profits to the private developers, the alignment of the M4 Extension has been chosen to go beneath residential properties.
5. Section 4.4.3 “Concord Interchange” – the preferred option “C4”, again shows bias toward the sustainability of commercial and industrial properties with no regard to the residential impact, impacting the individual’s dream of owning their own piece of land.
6. Figure 5.10 “Mainline Tunnel Long Section – Map 1” shows a depth of approximately 31m from top of tunnel to surface. In our particular location on Princess Avenue North Strathfield, we have been advised that the crown of tunnel will be only 25m from the existing surface level. Again, a misrepresentation of the depths of the tunnel.
7. Section 6.4.2 “Tunnelling” (Volume 1A) – States that drill and blast will not be used in the shallower sections. We have been advised that our property is currently 25m from the crown and coincidentally has a cross passage. We would assume that this would require the use of drilling and blasting. This method would put considerable stress on the pre-1930’s structure and also cause discomfort whilst this process is occurring.
8. Section 6.4.4 “Bridge Works” (Volume 1A) – Refer to Table 6.4

Concord Road interchange	Widening of Concord Road bridge, over the existing M4, and new eastbound on-ramp	<p>The Concord Road bridge would be widened to accommodate an eastbound tunnel on-ramp to the M4 East from Concord Road northbound. A portion of the existing bridge would be demolished along the line of the existing traffic barrier on the western side, and a new concrete deck ‘stitched’ to the existing bridge. The eastbound on-ramp would be constructed using the methodology for new bridge construction.</p> <p>Services under the existing western footpath would be relocated to a support frame below the superstructure.</p> <p>Where reasonable and practicable, work would be staged so that traffic lanes on the M4 could remain open during bridge widening. This would require works to be undertaken outside standard construction hours (refer to <b>section 6.7.2</b>).</p>
--------------------------	--	--

The table states that to reduce the impact on traffic, the works would need to be carried outside of Normal Working Hours. There are not any durations provided in the EIS to

explain the length of work, but work of this nature would not be simple and quick. It would be months of work.

The EIS does not address the noise mitigation or any respite and for what periods this work will occur. Continual work as described above will induce stress on the community.

9. Section 6.5.6 “Concord Road Civil and Tunnel Site (C5)” (Volume 1A) – The EIS uses the term “may” use noise mitigation measures. This being one of the main sites for the tunnel excavation and spoil removal will create an increase in noise to the area and also surrounding streets. The proposed access via Sydney Street would increase the volume of “noisy” trucks using the area, which is mainly light vehicular traffic at current.

This will also increase the traffic volumes in this area due to the amended signalling phases at the Intersection of Sydney Street and Concord Road. The area is already congested and instead of adding to the congestion, there should be a way of having all the access and egress via the existing M4 carriageway which is designed for the loads of heavy vehicles.

10. Section 6.7.1 “Construction Workforce” (Volume 1A), Table 6.21 Shows the peak estimated workforce numbers. In Particular, referring to the C5 site, there is a large number of workforce present at this site. This will create excess traffic noise and most importantly, from the proposed lay outs, it does not allow for car parking for this amount of people. This would lead to a spill out of vehicles into the existing streets.

Concord Road civil and tunnel site (C5)	290	200	45	45
---	-----	-----	----	----

Furthermore, this figure understates the peak workforce as it does not take into account the multitude of truck deliveries and spoil removal, obviously covered in another section, but a true indication of number should be provided that the full impact on the surrounding community can be ascertained.

11. Section 6.7.2 “Construction Work Hours” (Volume 1A) – Due to the current 24/7 program on the tunnelling works, the local area will see an increase of Heavy Vehicle Movements on local streets for the “C5” site. Concord Road is not predominantly a heavy vehicle route, it is mainly light vehicles.

Based on the provided volumes, there would be an estimate 35,000 Truck and Dog Movements from the “C5” site. With the proposed route via Sydney Street, as previously noted, minimal heavy vehicle usage, the exponential increase in heavy vehicle movements will create excessive noise which has not been accounted for in any of the report. The report only accounts for noise produced from a particular site, not the route to and from that site.

Under further sections of the noise monitoring, it is modelled against current background noises which in this case, do not take into account the heavy vehicle movements. The

movements whilst the heavy vehicles are entering site unloaded and banging across the bridge joints to the excessive noise expelled when loaded heavily leaving the site.

From the document, as the tunnel construction is operating 24/7, all the ancillary support will be required 24/7 and site "C5" is one of the main entry points. We believe that there is not enough information around noise modelling, nor information on noise mitigation to the local community.

12. Section 7.2 "Consultation Objectives" (Volume 1A) – We feel that none of the objectives have been met. It was not until we made contact with the Information line did we receive some form of consultation. This is disturbing since the tunnel is now proposed to be located beneath our property and to date we have had little consultation.
13. Section 8.3.1 "Construction Traffic Volumes and Routes" (Volume 1A) – As mentioned above, the amendments to Concord Road and Sydney Street intersection would increase the signal waiting times in an area that is already congested under its normal traffic operating conditions without the completion of the imminent high density developments.

This intersection has already been classified in the EIS as operating above its capacity and experiences high levels of delay during AM and PM peak. This will only be exacerbated with the "C5" site and current high density development in the local area. This is one of the important issues that requires attention to mitigate the impact, not exacerbate it.

Concord Road civil and tunnel site (C5)	Impacts would be limited to Concord Road and Sydney Street. The existing signals at Concord Road and Sydney Street would be modified to allow vehicles to enter and exit the site. This may result in delays to road users on Concord Road. Light vehicle impacts on surrounding streets are expected to be minimal. It is predicted that Ada and Alexandra streets would experience some additional light vehicle traffic. Parking along Ada, Edward and Alexandra streets in the vicinity of the site would be potentially impacted.
---	--

14. Section 10 "Noise and Vibration" (Volume 1A) – Is very vague in the way that it is written and does not provide any definitive answers to the amount of noise that will be generated during the construction and operational stages of the project. The EIS does state that there will be the possibility of noise exceedances at our property, but does not show any modelling at the locations provided in the EIS. Are these model a true representation of what will be expected during the course of the construction and operation.

The EIS does not provide any modelling beneath the properties that the tunnel is passing under in both the Construction and Operational phases. What is the direct impact?

15. Section 12.3.1 "Property and Land Use Impacts" (Volume 1B) – We are fall into the category of the 1 in 700 properties that will have a compulsory sub surface acquisition. During the initial concept designs, our property was not in this category. Since the construction was awarded to a private organisation, our property is now subject to a compulsory sub surface acquisition. We would like to understand how this has occurred when the original concepts were closer to the existing M4?



16. Section 12.4.2 “Land Use Impacts” (Volume 1B) – There has been no consideration taken into account to the future development potential of the properties under which the tunnel is currently aligned. The property at 49 Princess Avenue, when combined with the neighbouring properties creates a prime development site. It is currently an “R3” zoning, and based on the current adjacent zoning, Parramatta Road, it could be justified that the rezoning could be imminent based on residing on a direct rail line. This is mentioned in future strategy documents and can be seen in local areas such as Burwood and Rhodes, along the railway line. Again, there is reference to the loss of development potential to properties like ours that sit above the tunnel, but no reference to considerations provided to the property owners.
17. Section 13 “Urban Design and Visual Amenity” (Volume 1B) – the biggest misconception in the loss of character through the demolition of a number of heritage properties and properties that have meaning within the community. This does not show any compassion for the local community nor the visual amenity. How can the EIS justify the demolition of heritage listed properties or heritage significant properties. This could set precedents to developers with respect to heritage listed items. Not only developers, but what allows the Government to act against current planning laws?

The EIS makes reference to the following impacts:

- a. 22 off Heritage buildings to be demolished
- b. 9 off Potential heritage buildings to be demolished
- c. 2 off Conservation areas partially effected

The above impact is contradicting Section 30.2 of the EPAA (1979)

18. Section 19.3.1 “Historical Archaeology” (Volume 1B) – The demolition of period and existing heritage items and the encroachment of the new proposed facilities on existing heritage items would ruin the character and street scape of a neighbourhood rich in culture.
19. Section 20.3.1 “Direct Impacts” (Volume 1B) – It has been estimated that some 15.7Ha of planted vegetation will be lost during the construction of the project. The EIS does not address the replanting of the lost vegetation in adjacent areas. The beauty of the inner west is the amount of greenery and mature trees that line the streets, unlike the newer housing development areas such as Glenmore Park and Ropes Crossing. The EIS should address the vegetation credits that will be applied and where they will be planted in order to restore the natural beauty of the inner west.

20. We would like to note the following; Section 30.2 of the EPAA (1979) encourages the promotion and coordination of orderly and economic use and development of land. The objective is to minimise the impact on the surrounding natural and built environments and minimise the risk to existing development patterns.

Furthermore, it encourages protection to the environment, which is contravening the EIS as it makes reference to the clearing of vegetated areas, with no reference to reinstatement/replanting.

21. As per Appendix I, our property 49 Princess North Strathfield falls within "NCA06". Under this classification, the property is not eligible for any or partial noise mitigation. There is no conclusive supporting evidence to show that this property will not be affected in any way.

More importantly, during the construction, the ground borne noise will be excessive, at levels greater than the human comfort zone. Based on the alignment of the tunnel and the linking structure, we will experience high levels of discomfort and have not been made aware of the potential impacts. The EIS does indicate that the noise from the construction will exceed the evening and night criteria under the parameters set in the EIS

22. Section 6.3.1 "Construction" (Appendix J) – Does not adequately address the increase in air borne dust for the duration of the construction works. Our property will be subject to the increased air borne dust being adjacent to the Concord Road Interchange Site. There have not been any scientific studies to prove the short term effects of increased air borne dust. We have just experienced identical issues with the North Strathfield Rail Underpass, where an increase in air borne dust affected the general health of ourselves and our children and not to mention the fact that the swimming pool and house were constantly impacted and we were unable to open the windows in the house for the above reason.
23. Section 6.3.2 "Operational" (Appendix J) – Assessment of the short term air quality impacts have not been defined very well, but the EIS does indicate that there may be short term exceedences during break downs and accidents within the tunnel. There has not been any correlation to any other operational tunnels where this occurs. The correlation may prove that the short term exceedences are more frequent than portrayed in the EIS.
24. Section 7.5 "Overall Assessment" (Appendix J) – In contrary to all the information regarding any negative affects due to air quality, the Environmental Impact Assessment makes reference to the fact that there are signs of negative side effects to long term users of tunnels because of the increased levels of pollutants. If this is the case, this would also be the effect to local residents surrounding the vent stacks and tunnel exit/entries.
25. Section 8.5.2 "Mitigation Measures During Construction" (Appendix J) – This section has not identified any mitigation measures for construction noise. It does not even take into account any regular noise emission checks. Where is the compliance standard with this, it allows for a very broad spectrum of actions, basically allowing anything the contractor wants to do without recourse.
26. Section 8.5.4 "Summary of Impacts" (Appendix J) – There is not enough conclusive evidence with respect to health effects or type of mitigation measures as detailed design is not far enough advanced to determine the true impacts. Residents such as ourselves are disadvantaged, but to what degree are not yet known.



27. Section 9.2 “Changes in Traffic” (Appendix J) – During construction, due to the increased levels of traffic and waiting time, there will be significant impacts to our health, due to the increased levels of stress and anxiety. This is conclusive evidence within the EIS, that such traffic impacts will be detrimental to our health. The traffic in areas of the impacted areas is already at capacity and by introducing further traffic to the area will put further stresses on the residents and also increase the amount of pollution in the area. Perhaps alternate methods of spoil removal need to be explored. Why is the spoil removal not removed via the entry portal on the existing M4 motorway. Being defined as a heavy haulage route, it would seem a better option than using local roads which are not heavy haulage routes.

We feel that there has not been enough traffic modelling carried out in the area, as can be evidenced recently, where there have been traffic surveys been conducted. The traffic monitoring surveys have been implemented in the month of September 2015 and October 2015. These surveys should have been carried out previously and the true figures provided within the EIS for review by the general public. It is difficult to comprehend that the Government is approving the increased congestion of the local roads which are currently operating above capacity. We suggest that the view chosen by the Government would be to mitigate the “chocking” of the local road network during construction and if the project is successful, the ease on the surrounding local road network would be visible.

By “chocking” the local road network during construction, the immediate response after the completion of construction is praise for the project, but in true fact, the road network has just returned back to the capacity of where it was before the commencement of construction.

Further to the congestion, the Government will impose a toll for the newly constructed M4 extension. This will deter people from using the M4 and revert to using the local roads due to the cost of the travel. This needs to be explored and the results documented and considered from when the toll was removed from the M4 originally (and subsidised toll back scheme). The changes to the traffic patterns to Parramatta Road Vs the M4 should be modelled within the EIS to establish the actual effects on the local road network after the introduction of the tolls.

28. Section 9.6 “Overall Assessment” (Appendix J) – The report is rather inconclusive, indicating that the assessment is too complex to allow definitive results, yet the report illustrates a number of negative effects. There should be enough conclusive studies carried out on current operating tunnels and a more conclusive and detailed response should be provided.
29. Section 4.3 “Policy and Planning Setting” (Appendix L) – As part of table 4.14, it stipulates that in LCZ6 – Concord Road Precinct that it can be inferred that the council desire the future character of this area to conserve the identified characteristics. Unfortunately, this goes against the whole characteristics of the Concord Road Interchange. More importantly, as mentioned previously in this objection, the demolition of the heritage properties goes against the conservation of the local area.
30. Section 5.5 “Concord Road Civil and Tunnel Site (C5)” (Appendix L) – The EIS states that the visual impacts towards the residents (high) and pedestrians (high) would be rated as high, yet there have not been any mitigation measures adopted to mitigate the high rating.



Considering the duration of the project, we feel that consideration should be provided to minimise the visual impact to the residents.

31. Section 6.1.6 “Landscape Character Zone 6 – Concord Road Precinct” (Appendix L) – Below is the summary of the magnitude of the landscape character assessment:

**Table 6.6 LCZ 6 – Concord Road precinct landscape character assessment**

<b>Sensitivity and Magnitude</b>	<b>Landscape character assessment</b>
<p>The sensitivity of the landscape to change is considered to be low within the context of the existing busy road environment, existing entropy effects and proximity to the M4.</p> <p>The magnitude of change is high due the change in character from that of low density residential streets (albeit very busy ones), to that of a large motorway interchange with associated ramps, bridges and portals, flyover ramp, and freeway landscape incorporating large island areas of trees and grass.</p>	<p>This provides an overall landscape character impact assessment rating of moderate.</p>

The issue here is that the character assessment is restricted to the immediate character of Sydney Street and Concord Road. If the assessment area was slightly broadened to incorporate other areas such as Carrington Street and Princess Avenue, the overall landscape character assessment rate would change from moderate to high. We would like the character assessment to be broadened to encompass further areas.

32. Section 6.2.6 “Landscape Character Zone 6 – Concord Road Precinct” (Appendix L) – makes reference to “The R3 zoning identifies the desired future character to this zone to support future growth via urban intensification along and near to important strategic road and public transport corridors. This desire for urban intensification with increased building heights, associated increased bulk and scale” infers that our property with the subsurface acquisition will be hindered for any future development potential. Again, neither justification nor consideration has been provided to the affected residents. This needs to be addressed as it seems that the Government is not looking into the losses that will be suffered by the affected residents.
33. Section 6.3.1 “Urban Design Context” (Appendix L) – With reference to the Concord Road Interchange, the EIS addresses the Urban Design intent with some green space and future land use areas, but goes on to say that there are major programming challenges because of their size, isolation, the surrounding high capacity/high speed roads. It sounds that the area will be unsafe to access and requires further design to access the access, security and amenity. This could mean that the area may become inaccessible during the detailed design due to the safety associated with the community access and maintenance access.
34. Section 6.3.1 “Urban Design Context” (Appendix L) – With reference to the “Distribution Substation at Concord Road” addresses that the residual land may be developed at a future date. It fails to provide any dimensions of the building and states that it will be consistent with existing buildings. This is difficult to comprehend as the existing buildings are mostly period homes and the “Indicative axonometric view” does not fit within the character of the existing residences. It fails to reference what type of development may take place on this

residual land and in what time frame. Assuming that it is a substation and located directly over the tunnel, the residual use of the land will be limited. Could the substation be moved to an alternate location where it is not so prominent and detracts from the surrounding character? Or potentially constructed below ground?

35. Section 7.1 “Landscape Character and Visual Impact Mitigation Strategy” (Appendix L) – With respect to LCZ6, it states that where the “island” parks are located, they should actively encourage a significant level of park use, such as basketball courts and skate park. We feel that introducing basketball courts and/or skate park would attract the wrong type of people to the area. Currently it is a family friendly area with children equipment parks and playing fields. We feel that the same should be adopted in this location if under the detailed design the park is actually accessible.
36. Section 7.1.1 “General Recommendations” (Appendix L) – This section states that it should further engage appropriately qualified and experienced arborists and/or soil scientist to assess the feasibility of proposed tree planting on structure. We believe that this should already be done to provide detailed information to the community on the replanting scheme to replace all the cleared vegetation associated with the project.
37. Executive Summary (Appendix S) – With relation to “Area 2 – North Strathfield and Concord”, the EIS makes reference to the 14 heritage items and one HCA of local significance listed on *Canada Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013 (Canada Bay LEP 2013)* which would be affected by the project. The project will demolish aesthetically distinctive and rare Victorian-era houses. How can the government justify the demolition of two heritage items at the Concord Road interchange? At the least, they should be relocated to the residual land around the new substation location. There would be a major adverse impact on the heritage significance of the area which cannot be mitigated.

Furthermore, the Concord Road Interchange would also require the removal of approximately 16 to 18 trees at the Concord Road end of Sydney and Edward Streets, which are listed as heritage items. These impacts cannot be mitigated as per the EIS. Perhaps the trees should be relocated to a location in close proximity, and if not, they should not be removed. If they can be removed for the project, it sets a precedence for the removal of other heritage items where hindering development. There have been similar projects in the area where the trees from the median island of Victoria Road were removed and replanted in areas nominated by the local council for the community.

38. Section 6.10 “Potential Vibration and Noise Impacts” (Appendix S) – This section makes references to the potential impact on heritage listed items. Our property is not heritage listed, but being built in the 1920’s, is still constructed of very shallow footings with lime mortar. The vibration caused during the tunnel beneath our property could be detrimental to the structure. There has been no consideration or evidence provided regarding the effects to our property.
39. Section 6.1.1 “Direct Impacts (Appendix T) – Referring to the below table,

Table 6.1 Vegetation clearing

Location	Planted and screening vegetation (ha)	Grassland with scattered trees (ha)
North of M4 (between Homebush Bay Drive and Powells Creek)	6.9	1.2
South of M4 (between Homebush Bay Drive and Powells Creek civil site)	4.0	0.3
Concord Rd interchange including Queen St cycleway on-ramp	1.4	0.1
Cintra Park	0.3	0.6
Wattle Street and Dobroyd Parade	0.3	0.6
Total	12.9	2.8

The overall vegetation removal for the M4 East Extension is estimated at 12.9ha. Based on this, the 1.4ha of vegetation at the Concord Road Interchange would be more significant as it is a smaller footprint and would therefore be more noticeable.

Further to this, the EIS does not make any reference to the replanting of the lost vegetation. With the current environmental climate, we should be trying to preserve as much vegetation as possible rather than remove it to provide barren areas. The EIS does not state the replanting credits, it only makes very vague statements referring to the areas of potential replanting.

Further to these objections, we object to the communication that we have received as residents in the local area being affected by the project. Just recently, we have received a substrata acquisition letter and a letter from the contractor requesting that we respond by 28<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to book in a Dilapidation Report.

We have zero confidence that any Dilapidation Report will be just and fair based on recent experience with the North Strathfield Rail Underpass, where an increase in cracking to the property was poorly handled and dismissive.

Based on this communication, we feel that this objection will not be considered as the alignment and the progression of the project has already been decided. This goes against the whole planning approval. The people should be able to object to such a large infrastructure project before it is decided upon. As it stands, it seems that no matter what is obtained during the review of the EIS or if a protected species of frog, bird or plant is found, it would not change the alignment or viability of the project.

We feel that further consideration be explored for alternate alignments like under Parramatta Road, or potentially use the Complete Construction and Maintenance Cost over the life time of the project and consider establishing alternate "hubs" in locations like Badgerys Creek and Bella Vista.

Regards.

John and Catherine Tucker  
49 Princess Avenue  
North Strathfield 2137