

2 November 2015

ATT: Director of Infrastructure Projects
Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment

RE: SUBMISSION REGARDING EIS FOR WESTCONNEX M4 EAST
(Application number SSI 6307)

Dear Mr Stokes,

Architects Contempo has reviewed the voluminous and extensive Environmental Impact Statement for the WestConnex M4 East. Given the short and limited time constraint the noted issues are summarised. Accordingly, we wish to note the following issues and respectfully request that they are adequately addressed with detailed and specific responses:

1. EASTERN VENTILATION STACK AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES

After a detailed review of indicative plans, it is observed that the current ventilation stack design is unfiltered. What recourse or safeguards are in place to prevent and preclude an occurrence of an increase in the level of pollutants and odour emissions above the deemed “safe” and acceptable level by relevant regulatory health institutional organisations?

The health of the current and future residents nearby the proposed ventilation facility should be the main priority and consideration of the Baird Government, who will ultimately bare the responsibility and future compensatory health and legal claims should the facility be proven to increase the incidents of asthma attacks, respiratory issues and cancer related deaths.

When is the overall design of the ventilation stack going to be released on public exhibition for the community to review and comment on its features, design, and overall impact on the suburb of Haberfield and its surroundings? A State significant transport project such as the “Westconnex” should be subject to community consultation and involvement given the concerning potential impacts on the health of residents and existing visual presence of the heritage suburb.

2. ROADWAY, FOOTPATH AND NOISEWALL HEIGHTS AND LEVELS

Currently, there is inadequate detailed information in the EIS to enable proper assessment of the potential impacts, particularly the residents within the vicinity of Walker Avenue abutting the Wattle Street M4- M5 roadway treatments. The EIS should adequately assess the direct and individual visual, social, environmental and economic impacts on the subject properties.

The report does not include respective relative levels and accurate 3D models of the following:

- a) The proposed 3 metre wide footpath;
- b) The adjacent roadway and portal levels; and
- c) The height of the perimeter acoustic barrier walls relative to the existing natural ground levels of the adjoining north facing rear gardens of the abutting subject properties.

3. NOISE AND ACOUSTIC BARRIER WALLS

The acoustic barrier walls illustrated on the plan diagrams are identified between 3-5 metres in height, with no relative levels associated to the adjoining properties. I am particularly concerned with the overall potential impacts of overshadowing, bulk, relative scale and resultant blocking out of the currently available northerly sunlight will significantly diminish the existing aesthetic qualities, character and nature of our heritage property.

Although we understand that the proposed height of the wall is a necessity to eliminate the anticipated increase in noise produced by the relocated and anticipated increased traffic numbers. Nonetheless, we stress that a high solid wall is both visually inappropriate and would adversely impact of the value and heritage character of our subject property. We respectfully request that future detailed design incorporate a minimum 2 metre transparent glazed section to the top of the proposed noise wall.

4. LOSS OF PROPERTY VALUE

Since the announcement of the proposed road widening and associated tunnel and ventilation stack, property values in Haberfield within the area closest to the proposed infrastructure have suffered dramatic losses in the vicinity of \$200,000 approximately.

We acknowledge in years to come that Sydney is expected to have a population increase which requires efficient and appropriate road systems and public transport. However, why should any property owner suffer and not be commensurately compensated for the impact of public infrastructure proposed by any authority that adversely impacts on their property value due directly to the implementation of the proposed public utility? We would appreciate if this is addressed and not ignored as a matter of consequence.

We look forward and welcome your favourable and detailed response.

Yours Faithfully,

Josef Grzelak

Owner of 42 Walker Avenue Haberfield

Elizabeta Grzelak

DIRECTORS

A Suite 2203, Level 22 Tower 2
101 grafton street bondi junction nsw 2022

T +61 2 9388 0222

M +61 433 351 985

E elizabeth@architectscontempo.com.au, j.grzelak@architectscontempo.com.au