**Attention: Director, Infrastructure Projects** 

From: Ian 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....My wife Thea who has lived with me on our peaceful property for the last 18 years, now has Motor Neurone Disease, and with her condition, she becomes exhausted easily and must have rest. As the bedroom is across the road from the newly proposed development site (approximately 17 Metres), this is an unacceptable impost on my wife's ability to obtain that rest. She must have quiet to enable her 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.

Motor Neurone Disease is classed as a terminal illness with no cure and life expectancy can be 2-5 years, hopefully longer. This proposal has caused my wife considerable anxt and unfair anxiety. As her primary carer, I cannot allow this to happen.

#### 2. Tunnel location.

I reject EIS1 due to the fact ....Following discussions with NWRL on numerous occasions, it was apparent that nobody was able to tell me the exact location of the tunnels, either in depth or distance from my 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. This is unforgivable and shows a complete lack of empathy for myself and my family.

## 3. Station depth.

I reject EIS1 due to the fact ....Initial discussions with NWRL personnel were centred around an underground railway station with surface parking. I was disgusted to hear at the meeting on the 5<sup>th</sup> 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. Noise.

I reject EIS1 due to the fact ....It 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 I 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 our lives.

## 5. Dust.

I reject EIS1 due to the fact .....Having 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. It may even necessitate repainting in the near term. This is an unfair financial impost on me and my family.

## 6. Devaluation.

I reject EIS1 due to the fact .....It may be that my wife and I, due to her 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 reduce the quality of our lifestyle. Nobody at NWRL could deny that possibility.

### 7. Proposed site footprint...noise.

I reject EIS1 due to the fact .....In reference to page 43 of the EIS1, please refer to the Additional Segment Storage section. This area in proposed to be located directly across the road from my property, and upon discussions with NWRL employees it was outlined that this area is for the storage of pre-caste 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.** I 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 we be subjected to this noise, but also the glare of the cranes lights at night in this vicinity, right opposite our house.

### 8. Proposed site footprint...trees.

I reject EIS1 due to the fact ....Having 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 fact ....It was originally suggested to us 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 had it underground. It has also been further suggested that this station will be opened to the surface to allow passengers to see daylight during their journey.

My strong recommendation is that the Castle Hill station be that source of light, 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 area.

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

I reject EIS1 due to the fact .....It 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.

This additional truck traffic at potentially all hours (will already have a considerable impact on our lives locally. 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 at our house at night waking us up. Additional truck movements at night will be an annoyance and cause potential sleep deprivation to residents as it is (Refer page 15 of the EIS1 report. Construction traffic for material supply to and spoil removal from tunnelling sites)..

EIS1 states on page 15....states....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.

As previous outlined. I have Motor Neurone Disease, and must have complete quiet. Therefore we are 'sensitive noise receivers' 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 fact .....apart from the hazardous nature of potentially making Robert Road a sub-arterial road, (as per a discussion with 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

lan McLean

**5 Robert Road** 

Cherrybrook. NSW 2126