

12 September 2014

5a Penrhyn Ave

Beecroft 2119

Email: admin@safetyshare.info

Phone: 02 9871 3481

### **Submission on NorthConnex M1 to M2 Project**

I am a resident of Beecroft and there are two tunnels planned directly under my house in Penrhyn Avenue.

I am in favour of the project subject to some changes being made, as discussed below.

I believe there are some aspects of the project that will have an unacceptable impact on the local community, and I request that the following changes be made to the project:

1. Construction Traffic

There should be no construction trucks on local roads, and all construction traffic should be confined to Pennant Hills Rd and the M2. For example, construction traffic should not be permitted to use roads such as Aiken Rd, Oakes Ave and Eaton Rd. Spoil removal should be directly onto the M1 and M2 via the northern and southern portals. Pennant Hills Rd is already beyond capacity. The area between Pennant Hills Golf Course and Thompsons Corner is a steep hill and laden trucks going up the hill would be noisy and slow, resulting in noise pollution for many residents. Also, cars using Pennant Hills Rd would lane hop to avoid the slow trucks. Unladen trucks coming down the hill would be noisy due to brakes. There have been many accidents on the downhill section with trucks ending up on the footpath.

2. Air Quality

Exhaust emissions from vehicles currently using Pennant Hills Road is dispersed over the entire length of Pennant Hills Rd. Concentrating these exhaust emissions in two stacks at the southern and northern ends of the tunnels will spread the current dispersed emissions in the vicinity of these two stacks. The EIS modelling might show that the air quality in these areas will meet current health guidelines, but there will still be increased exhaust pollution levels for residents in the vicinity of these stacks

compared to current levels.

I believe that a good alternative to these two stacks alone is to construct additional stacks at the Wilson Road and Trelawney Street facilities. These stacks would be fed by fans installed in the two tunnels at these locations, so the exhaust emissions from each tunnel would be exhausted through three stacks. For example for the southern tunnel, one third of emissions would be exhausted through the Trelawney St stack, one third through the Wilson Road stack, and one third through the southern interchange stack.

I realise that this would cost more to implement than the two proposed stacks, but it would disperse the emissions over a much broader area at lower concentrations, and would be a fairer outcome for the residents in the vicinity of the two proposed stacks.

### 3. Construction Noise and Vibration

The EIS states that “properties located above the tunnels may experience ground-borne noise impacts while tunnelling is taking place near the property”, and “vibration levels from tunnelling may exceed the ‘preferred criteria’ for human comfort”.

There are two tunnels to be constructed directly under my property, and another tunnel right next to my property.

I submit that residents within say a 50m or 100m zone of the tunnels should be offered alternative accommodation for the periods that their property may be affected, especially for night time disturbance. The protocols for these arrangements should be determined before the project is approved.

I believe that the EIS is premature. There are many aspects of this project that have not been finalised – for example spoil disposal and spoil transport. I believe that the project should not be approved until all aspects have been finalised and fully assessed, including community consultation for affected residents.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Reid