

## Keith Ng

---

**From:** Yohan Premaratne on behalf of DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox  
**Sent:** Friday, 17 May 2019 11:02 AM  
**To:** Keith Ng  
**Subject:** FW: F6 Preferred Infrastructure Report

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Hi Keith,

We received yet another one for F6.

Do you want us to register this separately, or do you prefer to file this along with the other ones in your folder?

Kind regards,  
Yohan

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Peter Botterill <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 16 May 2019 4:38 PM  
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox <information@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Subject:** F6 Preferred Infrastructure Report

Attention Director - Transport Assessment

I do / do not want my name published with this submission.

The Preferred Infrastructure Report aims to describe design refinements proposed to address issues raised by the community during the EIS phase, being changes to local road egress and an extended cycleway. Not only are these proposals completely unsatisfactory to the community, the most serious of issues have been ignored.

The key issues against these latest proposals:

1. It is the third submission request during a school holiday break limiting time for analysis and responses.
2. The local road changes will result in 3 additional sets of traffic lights on President Avenue causing more traffic bank-up and more vehicle pollution.
3. The cycle-way will cause significant damage to the heritage-listed Patmore Swamp

The most serious of my issues have been ignored, being that the F6 tollroad is:

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 leaves families with staggering home repair bills due to ground subsidence
6. it exposes residents to long term construction and the associated construction fatigue
7. 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
8. 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
9. it fails to demonstrate that the stated objectives, contrived as they are after the decision to build more roads was made, can be achieved.
10. It makes no sense from a transport planning perspective

11. It represents a lost opportunity to really revitalise car dependent communities by giving us better public transport alternatives
12. It imposes expensive tolls on families and small business
13. it is out of step with modern transport planning.
14. Cnr of Marshall St & Rocky Point Road is an issue. Very difficult to turn into Rocky Point Rd.

The future of transport is all about innovation. Clever solutions look towards shared, connected, autonomous electric vehicles in conjunction with high-frequency mass transit. The F6 is a throwback from 1948.

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.

Yours sincerely,  
Peter Botterill

---

This email was sent by Peter Botterill 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 Peter provided an email address ( [REDACTED] ) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Peter Botterill at [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)