

Attention Director
Infrastructure Projects, Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
Application number SSI 6307
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

All comments in this submission pertain to the Concord Road interchange and the associated construction sites and their effect on 74 concord road unless otherwise noted.

RE: General EIS Comments

The EIS is a significant document totalling (at last count) 4377 pages. While this is great to have as a PDF, so that it can be searched and commented, the PDF is lacking in professional construction concepts. Content pages are not hyperlinks to the relevant section and landscape pages are not rotated independently for online viewing. The over use of acronyms and abbreviations, not all of which are listing in the references tables, make the document even harder to read and ensures that the reader must develop a detailed understanding of the area being discussed in order to gain any understanding at all.

Meanwhile providing this document in only digital form disadvantages many affected members of the community that are not familiar with reviewing digital documents and may not even have access to a computer. While I appreciate that it is available for review at various locations, but I have also found the advisors at some public locations to not be familiar with the document enough to be able to adequately assist. Where bulk printing and offering to at a minimal cost to particularly interested people would overcome this, where an individual would be forced to spend in excess of \$280 to print it privately.

The review period for a document this large is extremely restrictive, is not in alignment with other industries review periods and it does not provide a reasonable amount of time for the community to review the EIS, keeping in mind that these are member of the community who need to do this as well as all other commitments of day to day life, like work. I also find that the EIS is not very well formatted for a community consultation document. Many figures and tables are not fully explained or lack detail.

In summary I believe the EIS has not been produced in a manner appropriate for the intended purpose of informing the community and allowing the community to comment on the project. It assumes a high level of comprehension of technical detail and jargon, access to a computer and the ability to adequately read a digital document. The EIS review period is too short for the size and complexity of the project, a quick calculation (pages x 1 page per minute) would require 73 hours to read the whole document, but does not allow for comprehension or proper analysis of the information provided. I request that no approval is given to the project until an appropriate considered public communication is facilitated.

Yours Sincerely

David Manning
74 Concord Road North Strathfield