

1 November 2015

RE WESTCONNEX M4 EAST SUBMISSION - SSI 6307

I own a property on Walker Avenue, Haberfield adjacent to and wholly within 50m of the proposed Westconnex M4 East project.

I object to both the EIS process (the EIS) as well as the Westconnex M4 East project (the Project).

I object to the EIS process because the Requirements as set out under the Act have not been appropriately carried out:

1. Alternatives have not been properly considered as required.
2. Community consultation was not carried out comprehensively or in an appropriate manner:
 - a. Most heavily impacted areas, such as where my property is located, received virtually no focused contact from WDA.
 - b. When residents tried to make contact with WDA there was no action.
 - c. There is no evidence that comments and feedback given at public community consultation meetings were taken into consideration.
3. The environmental risk analysis has not been conducted properly nor utilising a suitable methodology:
 - a. My property has been identified in various impact contours, but the properties within the contours have been grouped together with no assessment of the levels of impact upon individual properties within the group.
 - b. Impacts have been averaged over the contours so a false appearance is given that no single property is significantly and cumulatively impacted.
 - c. My property has been identified as effected within 9 of 12 broad impact categories yet the EIS does not address this cumulative effect – only each individual impact.
 - d. There are other significant impacts not identified as relevant to my property which is clearly incorrect (eg tunnelling directly below my home at a very shallow depth of 15m where the average of other tunnelling is between 30 and 50m and the EIS states the minimum is 20m; another example is the closure of Allum Street which affects the utility and restricts access to my property). This demonstrates the analysis has not been correctly done.
4. Contingency plans to minimise risk are not sufficient:
 - a. Mitigation strategies proposed for single impacts will not minimise the impacts. For example, noise and air quality mitigation measures such as double glazing only provide mitigation whilst inside the house, our property is 50% outdoor areas including a pool and large verandah.
 - b. Mitigation strategies proposed to address one impact will create a different impact. For example, a noise wall proposed to mitigate this impact will create a further visual impact. This is not properly accounted for in the EIS and demonstrates a methodological failure.

- c. Mitigation strategies proposed to address a single impact are not sufficient in circumstances where the property will suffer multiple impacts. Again this illustrates a failure to properly provide plans to minimise impacts.
- d. Partial mitigation of a series of individual impacts will not minimise the accumulation of those impacts to any acceptable degree. If there are two impacts mitigated to 60% and 80% for example, the net mitigation is not an average of 70%. The mitigation of the impacts would be 48%. Therefore, properties such as mine where the EIS confirms multiple (9 categories at least), partially mitigated impacts, will suffer more than other properties because of the compounding reductions in the value of the proposed minimisation measures.
- e. In other cases the EIS confirms that the impacts cannot be mitigated. Where a single property will suffer significant and cumulative impacts, it is unacceptable that it should suffer a number of impacts that cannot be mitigated.

I object to the EIS and the Project because the EIS takes a broad-ranging approach and makes generalisations about impacts – essentially it averages impacts across the individual impact contours and indeed across the Project corridor. This does not take into account the specific and cumulative impacts to particular properties and residents. Obviously some properties are closer to the proposed Project roadway than others and therefore will be more heavily impacted. My property is adjacent to and wholly within 50m of the proposed Project and will be impacted from multiple sources.

I object to the EIS because it:

1. fails to address accumulation of individual impacts on specific properties such as mine;
2. makes no assessment the significance of cumulative impacts on specific properties because each impact is analysed individually; and
3. does not provide for compensation to those residents or acquisition of those properties suffering significant cumulative impacts.

The EIS confirms there will be substantial, multiple and therefore cumulative, impacts to my property which is directly adjacent to the Project precinct. These include:

1. The EIS confirms that my property is in an area impacted in multiple ways to various extents. It is clear from the EIS my property is located at the junction of three impact areas, reflecting three construction impact sources and two of the three will become major permanent impact sources going forward. The EIS notes that my property is in a zone impacted in 9 of 12 broad categories:
 - a. Air quality
 - b. Noise and vibration
 - c. Human health
 - d. Shadowing
 - e. Urban design, landscape character and visual impact
 - f. Social impact
 - g. Economic impact
 - h. Soils and water
 - i. Non-aboriginal heritage
2. My property is one of the most significantly effected in the various contours. The Project involves construction up to and including the rear boundary of my property – the rear boundary will be 10m from the proposed roadway and 20m from an exit portal on Wattle Street. Furthermore, tunnelling directly below my home will be at a very shallow depth of 15m where the average of other tunnelling is between 30 and 50m. A further example is the closure of Allum Street which will directly affect the utility of and restrict access to my

property. Yet the EIS does not differentiate between properties within each contour and does not address the cumulative impact of all of the above categories.

3. The Property will be subject to substantial impacts both during construction and when operational. The extent and number of the impacts means that me, my family and my property will suffer significant cumulative impacts which the EIS confirms. These impacts include risks to health, critical loss of amenity and unacceptable noise. For example, impacts on access to the Property, dust and noise, interference with daily activities, studying and conversation, leading to stress, annoyance and sleep disturbance as well as more significant health impacts.

The Project has already resulted in substantial economic, social and human health impacts to me, my family and my property including the fact our home has become unmarketable and unsaleable and considerable anxiety has been experienced by all members of our family.

The current and future impacts cannot be controlled and there are no feasible mitigation measures that can address them other than by acquisition. It is unacceptable that the Government minimise compulsory acquisitions, and leave those adjacent to the project corridor with significant cumulative impacts with no remedy. If the Project is aimed at achieving a benefit for multiple residents across the city and state by improving transport networks then it should not do so at the expense (personal and financial) of those significantly impacted.

I object to the approval of the Project without adequate provision being made for those residents who, and properties which, will be significantly and cumulatively impacted.

I object to the approval of the project unless a condition is included that a voluntary acquisition scheme be established.

Yours sincerely



Dr Erika J Techera