

Attention: Director, Infrastructure Projects

**From: Thea McLean, Resident of 5 Robert Road,
Cherrybrook.**



Major Projects Assessment

Department of Planning Infrastructure,

23-33 Bridge Street

Sydney NSW 2000



Application Number (SS1-5100)

Re: Response to the North West Rail Link (NWRL)-
Environmental Impact Statement 1 (EIS1)

Attention: Director, Infrastructure Projects

Major Projects Assessment

Department of Planning Infrastructure,

23-33 Bridge Street

Sydney NSW 2000

Application Number (SS1-5100)

Re: Response to the North West Rail Link (NWRL)-Environmental Impact Statement 1 (EIS1)

I hereby confirm that I do not support the most recent Environmental Impact Statement 1 released by NWRL.

This submission is supplemental to the jointly prepared submission by "the Robert Road Group", in light of my unique circumstances both location and family health wise, in relation to the newly proposed Cherrybrook Railway Station.

My reasons for my strong rejection of EIS1 are as follows:

1. Motor Neurone Disease.

I reject EIS1 due to the fact....I am a resident who has lived on our peaceful property for the last 18 years , however as of December 2011, I now have been diagnosed with Motor Neurone Disease, and with my condition, I become exhausted easily and must have rest. As my bedroom is in the front of the house across the road from the newly proposed development site (approximately 17 Metres) , this is an unacceptable impost on my ability to obtain that rest. I must have quiet to enable me to gain sufficient rest to live as close to a normal life as possible. I will strongly reject and take action against any proposal to move the development site moved further west than the originally proposed footprint which did not impact Robert Road.

This proposal has caused me considerable anxiety and unfair distress.

2. Tunnel location.

I reject EIS1 due to the factFollowing my husbands discussions with NWRL on numerous occasions, it was apparent that nobody was able to tell him the exact location of the tunnels, either in depth or distance from our boundaries. Given my potential proximity to the proposed tunnels and my obvious concerns, to not be able to supply this information is unforgivable.

I cannot, therefore, assess the potential tunnel boring noise impact, the vibration impact, or potential train noise/vibration impact on my property and therefore, my life. This is unforgivable and shows a complete lack of empathy for myself and my family. This exact information was requested on numerous occasions.

3. Station depth.

I reject EIS1 due to the factMy husbands initial discussions with NWRL personnel were centred around an underground railway station with surface parking. I was disgusted to hear that at the meeting on the 5th May, that in fact the design is to now have a station open to the surface, thus proposing additional issues for the local residents to now consider as an impost on their living standards. Additionally, considerable effort was now null and void in terms of the time residents spent in discussing and preparing potential development plans on the original station footprint well west of Robert Road.

4. General Site Noise.

I reject EIS1 due to the factIt has been reported by Councillor Bruce Mills (Councillor for B Ward, Hornsby Shire Council) that **large construction sites are noisy and dirty, and Cherrybrook Station will be no different-it is proposed to be a major construction area for the North West Rail Link, operating as a large construction site for up to six years.**

I reject your proposal to have that noise impact my life, when it did not appear on any area plans when we acquired this property. A proposed barrier directly across the road "up to" 6 metres in height will not stop the additional noise that will impact my life.

5. Dust.

I reject EIS1 due to the factHaving recently (December 2011) outlaid considerable capital to have my house repainted on the outside in a boathouse dark blue colour (supported by the fact this has always been a clean air zone in a heavily treed area since we have lived here for the last 18 years), I believe that a major development site across the road will generate considerable airborne dust and dirt, and this will settle on my house, thus causing it to constantly have a dirty appearance and reduce its value. At the least it will need constant cleaning and it may even necessitate repainting in the near term. This is an unfair financial impost on me and my family. In particular on my husband whom I do not wish to be climbing to such heights, as he is my primary carer.

6. Devaluation.

I reject EIS1 due to the factIt may be that my husband and I, due to my illness (Motor Neurone Disease) may need to **sell** our property and move in the future to be nearer to our children. Given the now unveiled plans for the new Cherrybrook Station footprint on our road, our property values in the near term, more than likely, will suffer quite dramatically. Nobody at NWRL could deny that possibility.

Should we decide to **rent** our property and rent a property of equal rent value closer to our children, the rental value for our house in the near term, more than likely, will suffer quite dramatically and therefore reduce the quality of our lifestyle at our new destination. Nobody at NWRL could deny that possibility.

7. Proposed site footprint...Segment Storage noise.

I reject EIS1 due to the factIn reference to page 43 of the EIS1, please refer to the Additional Segment Storage section. This area is proposed to be located directly across the road from my bedroom, and upon my husband's discussions with NWRL employees it was outlined that this area is for the storage of pre-cast concrete sections critical for the tunnel building process. Upon receipt of the sections on site, they will be stored in this area, and when needed, accessed by a permanent crane located on the site and swung over to the tunnel access point.(Note: This area will not be housed in an acoustic shed).

Refer page 15 of the EIS1 report. **Construction traffic for material supply to and spoil removal from tunnelling sites.** My husband was advised by a NWRL employee that these concrete sections are integral to the construction of the tunnels and there can be no guarantee given that they would not be accessed **24 hours a day, seven days a week.**

This is totally unacceptable as not only will I be subjected to this noise across the road, but also the glare of the cranes lights at night in this vicinity, right opposite our house, will more than likely illuminate our property and interrupt our sleep. According to my husband, this could not be denied by NWRL employees.

8. Proposed site footprint...trees.

I reject EIS1 due to the factHaving been a resident of this street for 18 years I am strongly opposed to the removal of the trees across the road in any form. We purchased our property in the Hills District due to the heavily wooded nature of the surrounding area, and the continual removal of trees from properties adjoining ours has been a source of continual annoyance and distress for us. I have previously fought Council on such matters and propose to do so again in terms of the expanded footprint of EIS1.

9. Proposed site footprint.....station.

I reject EIS1 due to the factIt was originally suggested to my husband that the station was moved further west to accommodate union concerns in relation to working under power lines. It was then brought to our attention this was not the prime reason...in fact it was due to the station now having to reach the surface at a point further west of that originally proposed by the previous planners who designed the station to be underground. It has also been further suggested that this station will be opened to the surface so as to allow passengers to see daylight during their journey. It was also outlined to my husband by a NWRL employee that the travel time underground would be unhealthy for the passengers. I dispute that statement given the number of underground stations around the world with a longer underground period than the proposed NWRL.

My strong recommendation is that the Castle Hill station be that source of light should it actually be required, and that the proposed Cherrybrook Station remains underground (as per the original design), and the area undergoes minimal surface impact as possible in harmony with the surrounding wooded areas.

10. Proposed site footprint.....trucks.

I reject EIS1 due to the factIt is now proposed that the major equipment for tunnel boring will be introduced and removed from the tunnels from this location. As well, all spoil will be removed from this area.

(Refer page 15 of the EIS1 report. **Construction traffic for material supply to and spoil removal from tunnelling sites**) This additional truck traffic at potentially all hours will already have a considerable impact on our lives locally. Currently, trucks heading east along Castle Hill road are required to minimise use of their air breaks as they come over the crest at/near County Drive. The sound travels down the valley and can be heard by residents at night, waking us up.

(Refer page 15 of the EIS1 report. ...**At locations where sensitive noise receivers are close to construction sites, significant construction vehicle movements are likely to be restricted during evening and night-time periods.** Additional truck movements at night will be an annoyance and cause potential sleep deprivation to residents as it is.

As previously outlined. I have Motor Neurone Disease, and must have complete quiet. Therefore I am a 'sensitive noise receiver' and require the cessation of any construction vehicle movements during evening or night time periods. On page 15 ...it reports...'movements are **likely** to be restricted'....that is unacceptable to myself and my family.

11. Road noise – Robert Road.

I reject EIS1 due to the factapart from the hazardous nature of potentially making Robert Road a sub-arterial road, (as per a discussion between my husband, the Robert Road Group and a NMRL

employee), with workers shuttle buses and traffic accessing the site initially during construction, and thereafter for general bus and commuter traffic use so as to avoid Castle Hill Road (as outlined in the Robert Road Group submission), the resultant noise of this additional traffic movement will be considerable and make sleeping in the front of our house unbearable.

In conclusion:

I reject EIS1 due to the fact....the newly proposed site now impacts mine and my family's life to an unacceptable level as outlined above.

Regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thea McLean'.

Thea McLean

5 Robert Road

Cherrybrook. NSW 2126