

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, 27 April 2019 4:43 PM  
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox  
**Subject:** F6 Preferred Infrastructure Report

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Attention Director - Transport Assessment

The Preferred Infrastructure Report aims to describe design refinements proposed to address issues raised by the community during the EIS phase. Although I do not object to the changes to local road egress and extended cycleways, it is an insult to the community to ignore the most serious of our concerns.

This project is not about what is best for the community nor is it about solving congestion issues.

As it stands stage 1 of the F6 project is nothing but a shift in traffic congestion. Tax payer money being spent to move traffic from Princes Highway and The Grand Parade onto an already congested President Ave. Is this a genuine solution?

There is no provision or mention of improving heavy vehicle traffic travelling to Port Botany. Port activity will be increasing in the future and there needs to be a plan in place now for increase in traffic. This is already an issue today. Why has this been ignored?

Full speed ahead with Stage 1 yet there is no commitment to Stage 2 from President Ave to Taren Point. Where is the logic in taking so much away from the local community for 4 kilometres?

We are losing open space, playing fields wildlife habitats and skate park. Compulsory acquisition of homes and businesses and in return the community will be rewarded with unfiltered ventilation stacks, health issues, and exposure to years of dust, noise & stress. All for a toll trap that will be a failure in what it sets out to do.

The negatives far outweigh the positives.

This project is nothing more than a money making exercise and an insult to the community.

Key issues raised by the community against the F6 are due to this tollroad being being:

- 1.inconsistent with the community preference for public transport enhancements.
- 2.it worsens local traffic congestion
- 3.it increases dangerous diesel pollution from tunnel portals, unfiltered exhaust stacks and the inevitable induced traffic
- 4.it removes critical greenspace and heavily impacts sensitive wetlands
- 5.it reduces urban livability due to increase in traffic noise and the physical barriers roads cause through the local environment
- 6.it leaves families with staggering home repair bills due to ground subsidence
- 7.it exposes residents to long term construction and the associated construction fatigue
- 8.it fails to demonstrate how it will create a "vibrant commercial area in a pedestrian friendly environment" when extended clearways are also proposed on key local routes
- 9.it fails to identify or address the significant negative impacts of roads on people and the loss of community health in two ways – by encouraging walking and reducing car dependence
- 10.it fails to demonstrate that the stated objectives, contrived as they are after the decision to build more roads was made, can be achieved.
- 11.It makes no sense from a transport planning perspective
- 12.it is not in the public interest, rather, it is in the interest of Transurban to pump more toll revenue to the M5
- 13.It represents a lost opportunity to really revitalise car dependent communities
- 14.It imposes expensive tolls on families and small business

The community has also raised key concerns regarding the behaviour of the proponent and sub-contractors exhibited with other WestConnex phases:

- 1.Failure to repair homes damaged by construction and tunnelling, as reported by families from Homebush, Haberfield, North Strathfield, St Peters to Beverly Hills.
- 2.Failure to properly manage the long-term intrusion into people's lives due to insufficiently regulating, monitoring, mitigating nor enforcement of conditions of approval, as weak as they are.
- 3.Failure to properly manage complaints. The experience residents elsewhere have, when they have legitimate complaints about dust, noise or other, is one of slow response and often no response.
- 4.Consistent breach of promises on repairing the urban environment on completion.
- 5.Failure to not benchmark the cost of the toll road against the cost of rail solutions represents a serious and significant shortcoming of the F6 Extension EIS and Business Case
- 6.Community consultation sessions that are a sham
- 7.Failure to disclose details of the contract with Transurban including "no compete" and "minimum revenue" clauses
- 8.Failure to disclose the details of all stages of the F6 to the public. If it's a great proposal to benefit the public, why is it shrouded in secrecy? Rail proposals (usually that never see the light of day) are regularly announced as that is what the public want and need.
- 9.Failure of the Department of Planning and Environment in enforcing compliance with conditions of approval, as weak as they are. Where is the protection to the community?

The F6 tollroad is out of step with modern transport planning, where

I consider the inadequacy of the F6 Extension is so profound that I do not consider that it can be used as the basis for a Ministerial determination to approve the project.

In short, I reject motorway investment of this scale, in this century, and that public transport, such as rail infrastructure (light, heavy, freight) is better able to keep this city livable and functional if we wish to maintain a 'global' economic status based on population and investment growth.

Please do not publish my personal details

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Kogarah, New South Wales, 2217, Australia

---

This email was sent by [REDACTED] via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however G provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)