

From: Kimberley Siau [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 30 April 2019 12:49 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: F6 Preferred Infrastructure Report

Attention Director - Transport Assessment

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

I am 25 years old and I have lived on President Ave for my whole life. My parents are hard working and do a lot for the community, we would hate to see this motorway being built right next to our home. We have only just recently done a huge home renovation and we are so happy with our new beautiful home, but now we are extremely disappointed that this will now be surrounded by even more traffic and pollution than ever before. I find it really difficult to believe that the state and federal government say that they are looking out for it's hard working citizens when they are doing this to my community who I know feel the exact same way as I do. Please please reconsider this project. You will cause more pollution, more traffic and more disruption to our locals and it is really not fair.

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.

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,
Kimberley Siau

This email was sent by Kimberley Siau 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 [REDACTED], however Kimberley provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kimberley Siau at [REDACTED]

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