Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

3600

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

a) The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
b) Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
c) There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
d) Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
e) Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
f) Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
g) The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
h) According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
i) This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
j) Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
k) The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
l) Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Naomi Corlew Suburb: 2042 Postcode: 2042
Street Address: 96/38 FORBES ST Email Address: LaePapua@Gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

3601

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: gillian mackay Suburb: Alexandria Postcode: 2015
Street Address: 33 Newton St Email Address: gillianmackay@yahoo.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

i. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
ii. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
iii. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
iv. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
v. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
vi. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
vii. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
viii. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
ix. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
x. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
xi. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
xii. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
xiii. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: MIKE BARLEY Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode: 2042
Street Address: 20/6-8 MARY ST Email Address: Mike@grance.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

I. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.

II. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.

III. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.

IV. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.

V. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.

VI. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.

VII. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.

VIII. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.

IX. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.

X. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

XI. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.

XII. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Nic Hamstra Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042
Street Address: _____ Email Address: nichamstra@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

.....

Name: Ian Buchel Suburb: ERKO Postcode: 2093
Street Address: _____ Email Address: Ian_buchell@hotmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

i. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.

ii. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.

iii. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.

iv. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.

v. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.

vi. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.

vii. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.

viii. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.

ix. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.

x. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

xi. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.

xii. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Kim Rotard Suburb: Rozelle Postcode: 2039
Street Address: 23 Parsons St Email Address: kim@dynamitepro.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

i. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.

ii. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.

iii. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.

iv. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.

v. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.

vi. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.

vii. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.

viii. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.

ix. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.

x. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

xi. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.

xii. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Chris Morrison Suburb: Homeless Postcode: _____
Street Address: _____ Email Address: Lokipenpen@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
2. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
3. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
4. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
5. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
6. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
7. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
8. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
9. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
10. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
11. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
12. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Nicole McKinstry Suburb: PETERSHAM Postcode: 2049
Street Address: 28 Andreas Email Address: nicolemckinstry@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

01. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
02. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
03. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
04. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
05. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
06. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
07. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
08. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
09. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
10. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
11. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
12. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
13. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Tori Beasley Suburb: Canterbury Postcode: 2168
Street Address: 6 Lamont Pl. Email Address: —

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

3609

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

a) The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
b) Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
c) There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
d) Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
e) Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
f) Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
g) The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
h) According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
i) This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
j) Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
k) The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
l) Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Ingrid Ferreira Suburb: Leichhardt Postcode: 2040
Street Address: 42 Flood Street Email Address:

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

a. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
b. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
c. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
d. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
e. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
f. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
g. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
h. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
i. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
j. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
k. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
l. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
m. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Janet Harris Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042
Street Address: 6/20 Fitzgerald St Email Address:

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
2. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
3. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
4. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
5. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
6. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
7. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
8. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
9. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
10. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
11. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
12. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Craig Murray Suburb: Chippendale Postcode: 2008
Street Address: 52 City Rd Email Address:

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

3612

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

A. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
B. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
C. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
D. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
E. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
F. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
G. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000residents. Ashmore: 6,000residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000residents.
H. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000residents, 25,000workers. With an extra 150,000people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
I. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
J. This project will carve 11,000square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
K. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM25 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
L. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
M. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Elizabeth Paz Suburb: Georges Hall Postcode: 2198
Street Address: 2 Doxington Ave Email Address:

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: D. ANTARAKIS Suburb: PYRMONT Postcode: 2009
Street Address: 34/209 HARRIS ST Email Address: dantarakis@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

I. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
II. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
III. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
IV. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
V. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
VI. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
VII. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
VIII. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
IX. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
X. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
XI. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
XII. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
XIII. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: C J STANTON Suburb: TEMPE Postcode: 2044
Street Address: 55 SANDWELL ST Email Address:

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

a) The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
b) Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
c) There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
d) Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
e) Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
f) Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
g) The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
h) According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
i) This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
j) Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
k) The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
l) Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Alyce Kelly Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042
Street Address: 2/489 King Email Address: alyce.e.kelly@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

[redacted]

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: KIRSTEN OCKENDEN Suburb: HURLSTONE PARK Postcode: 2193
Street Address: 36 GARNET Email Address: missykoko2@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

a. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
b. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
c. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
d. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
e. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
f. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
g. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
h. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
i. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
j. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
k. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
l. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
m. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: KIRSTEN OCKENDEN Suburb: HURLSTONE PARK Postcode: 2193
Street Address: 36 GARNET Email Address: missykoko2@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Luke Rogers Suburb: Enmore Postcode: 2042
Street Address: Unit 5/9 cambridge St Email Address: rogers_luke001@hotmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Jill Sykes Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042
Street Address: 77 St. Mary St Email Address: jill.sykes2015@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Kevin Meagher

Name: KEVIN MEAGHER Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode: 2042

Street Address: _____ Email Address: kevmmar@optusnet.com.au

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: IAIN SANDLER. Suburb: STANMORE. Postcode: 2048.
Street Address: 3/157 CAVENDISH ST. Email Address: its@iswie.com.au.

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: MICHAEL SCHIEN Suburb: Stanmore Postcode: _____
Street Address: 10 Mornington Rd Email Address: michael.schien@newcastle.edu.au

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

01. The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution is already exceeds acceptable levels in some affected areas. When the health of residents are concerned they should have been given information about negative impacts in a way that could be understood.
02. I object to the removal of community parks along the M5 East that the community has built up over decades after their community was carved up that motorway, only to see them threatened by a new tollway.
03. I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. Westconnex must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents is at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to claim 'ownership' of a model.
04. Scientific experts agree that there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads.
05. Plans to expand roads to within 5 metres of residents' homes is outrageous. I am aware that in cases in St Peters and Alexandria it is within 2 metres.
06. The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact the results reveals in Appendix J could be far worse because monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters where only 30% of results could be included. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence.
07. The noise monitoring is inadequate for St Peter because there is no attempt to consider the cumulative impacts including on health for aircraft and tollway construction and later operation.
08. Independent experts have reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore not reliable.
09. I am particularly concerned about the community on Stoney Creek Road. The RMS and AECOM have not consulted properly with this community or informed residents that Westconnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality in their neighbourhood worse
10. Westconnex has kept its plan to take 14,000 hectares of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8000 hectares, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths and exercise equipment will be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable to me.
11. Noise monitoring has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation on thousands of Sydney residents.

Name: Kate Barrett Suburb: Enmore Postcode: 2042
Street Address: 34 Tipper Email Address: barringtonkate@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

a. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
b. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
c. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
d. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
e. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
f. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
g. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
h. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
i. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
j. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
k. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
l. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
m. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Juliette Younger Suburb: Darlington Postcode: 2008
Street Address: 40 Lander St Email Address: julietteyounger@hotmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

i. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.

ii. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.

iii. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.

iv. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.

v. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.

vi. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.

vii. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.

viii. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.

ix. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.

x. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

xi. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.

xii. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Gregory Rooks Suburb: Wentworth Falls Postcode: 2782
Street Address: 3 Boronia Rd Email Address: gregchuckbrooks@yahoo.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1st. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.

2nd. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.

3rd. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.

4th. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.

5th. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.

6th. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.

7th. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.

8th. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.

9th. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.

10th. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.

11th. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

12th. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.

13th. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: S.R. Banks Suburb: Enko Postcode: 2443
Street Address: _____ Email Address: aromatherapy@live.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

.....

Name: Amy Liu Suburb: BEXLEY Postcode: 2207

Street Address: _____ Email Address: [illegible]

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

i. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
ii. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
iii. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
iv. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
v. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
vi. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
vii. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
viii. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
ix. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
x. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
xi. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
xii. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
xiii. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Louise Thornthwaite Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042
Street Address: Kent St Newtown Email Address:

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

3630

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
2. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
3. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
4. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
5. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
6. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
7. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
8. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
9. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
10. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
11. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
12. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

[redacted]

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

a) The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
b) Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
c) There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
d) Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
e) Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
f) Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
g) The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
h) According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
i) This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
j) Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
k) The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
l) Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: ANN CUDDY Suburb: ERSKINEVILLE Postcode: 2043
Street Address: 3 BRIDGE ST Email Address: dmcle o optusnet. com au

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

- The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.
- Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.
- There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.
- Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.
- Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.
- Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.
- The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.
- Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.
- According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.
- This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.
- Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.
- The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.
- Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

.....

Name: EI-UNG TAN Suburb: STANMORE Postcode: 2048
Street Address: 2/175 TRAFALGAR ST Email Address: eiling-tan@hotmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

a) The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.

b) Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.

c) There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.

d) Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.

e) Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.

f) Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.

g) The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.

h) Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.

i) According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.

j) This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.

k) Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

l) The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.

m) Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: MICHAEL BAKER Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode: 2042
Street Address: 32/20 Fitzgerald St Email Address: mike@michaelbaker.com.au

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

A. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.

B. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.

C. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.

D. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.

E. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.

F. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.

G. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.

H. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.

I. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.

J. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.

K. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

L. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.

M. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Martin Kelly Suburb: Enmore Postcode: 2042
Street Address: 32 London st Email Address: mjk_cms@yahoo.com.au

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

Secretary
Department of Planning and Environment
Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 : Date 23-24 Jan 2016

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1st. The air quality study shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to surface roads.

2nd. Westconnex will cause costly traffic chaos throughout the Inner West. It is unacceptable that no traffic modelling was done past two intersections after the end of the project.

3rd. There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.

4th. Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.

5th. Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.

6th. Most of the information about how Westconnex will deal with the negative impacts on residents, businesses and schools is pushed off to the post planning approval stage. This is unreasonable and leaves many in a state of great uncertainty.

7th. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS: Green Square: 61,000 residents. Ashmore: 6,000 residents. Waterloo Estate: 30,000 residents.

8th. Central 2 Eveleigh: 56,000 residents, 25,000 workers. With an extra 150,000 people in an area of a few square kilometres, this is going to be the most densely populated area in Australia. There is no evidence that the traffic models have factored in this huge increase in density that will occur in the area.

9th. According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. Adding extra lanes to Euston will not help because the roads that Euston Road feeds are also gridlocked. Traffic does not simply dissipate once it leaves the M5. It will increase damage done to the area and cause rat-running.

10th. This project will carve 11,000 square metres from Sydney Park and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This damage is particularly felt, because this area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, even without considering the future in-fill projects that are already in progress.

11th. Alexandria residents are already exposed to levels of PM2.5 particles that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

12th. The new M5 is an unfair waste of taxpayers' money that could be better used elsewhere, such as on projects that improve transport infrastructure out west or in the regions, or in the Alexandria and Erskineville area to help residents cope with the massive rise in density that they are facing over the next ten years.

13th. Westconnex is no solution to traffic congestion as the EIS shows that several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (the worst) after the project.

Name: Melano Sofkadze Suburb: Alexandria Postcode: 2015
Street Address: 3 Lyne street Email Address: hop.mel@gmail.com

Please publish this submission on the NSW Department of Planning and Environment website

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: DAVID HUEY Email: [redacted]

Suburb: LANE COVE Postcode: 2066

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: KAMARA Email: [redacted]

Suburb: MARRICKville Postcode: 2204

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: P. Upcroft Email: [redacted]

Suburb: Enmore Postcode: 2042.

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Bianca Pedzo Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Patricia Baird Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: Newcastle Postcode: 2264

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: David Bonna Email: [redacted]

[redacted] Marrickville

Suburb: — Postcode: 2204

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: [redacted] Email: [redacted]

Suburb: [redacted] Postcode: [redacted]

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Shirley Kemp Email: [redacted]

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Lucy Torres Email: [redacted]

Address: _____

Suburb: _____ Postcode: 2018

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Mario Chessa Email: _____

Address: _____

Suburb: _____ Postcode: _____

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: BRIAN VILLAHERMOSA Email: [redacted]

Suburb: ST PETERS Postcode: 2044

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: LIZ BASSO Email: [redacted]

Suburb: MARRICKVILLE Postcode: 2204

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: S. Lord Email: [redacted]

Suburb: MARRICKVILLE Postcode: 2204

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Amanda Whittaker Email [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: SILVIA SEIBERT Email: [redacted]

Suburb: ST PETERS Postcode: 2044

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Daniel Mills Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: Summer Hill Postcode: _____

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Grant Browne Email: [redacted]

[redacted] Marrickville

Suburb: _____ Postcode: 2204

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Kate Ukleja Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2016

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

3654

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: KIM DAVIES Email: [redacted]

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Asad Au Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: Enmore Postcode: 2042

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

3656

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: D. SHEEHAN Email: [redacted]

Suburb: Enmore Postcode: 2042

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: GRIMES FAMILY Email: [redacted]

Suburb: M'VILLE Postcode: 2204

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Victoria Stone Email: [redacted]

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Kayleigh Maltz Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203.

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: F. SAVIDIS Email: N/A

[redacted]

Suburb: MARRICKVILLE Postcode: 2204

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

3661

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Michele Margolis Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: ENMORE Postcode: 2042

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: [redacted] Email: [redacted]

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: MONIQUE LYSIAK Email: [redacted]

Suburb: MARRICKVILLE Postcode: 2204

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

3664

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

X

Name: Ruby Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: _____ Postcode: 2204

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Julianne Lessop Email: [redacted]

Suburb: Enmore Postcode: 2042

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

3666

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Michele Lisecka Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: Chiswood Postcode: 2042

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Roger Tait Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: LYNNE FAIRY. Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: CAMPERDOWN Postcode: 2050

The Secretary
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I object to the project and the whole WestConnex because:

1) homes and businesses, and the **distress and trauma** this has caused.
2) **No business case** was released until late in 2015. It has now been released but has so many redactions that it can't be independently assessed.
3) A **lack of transparency and accountability** and secrecy in this massive project for which costs are escalating at the rate of $2 billion a year.
4) A failure to consider negative impacts of the whole project (for example, total loss of vegetation) while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project.
5) These **businesses are part of a thriving economy** and street life that would be destroyed by increased traffic. Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that that they will not create clearways are worthless.
6) Westconnex's **failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos** that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value.
7) The enormous amounts of **extra traffic that will be dumped by WestConnex into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore**; the failure to do traffic modelling outside the project leaving the public to later deal with environmental and financial costs of worsening traffic congestion. This is no solution to traffic congestion.
8) **A failure to seriously analyse alternatives to WestConnex in this EIS**, including public transport combined with other options that would be a better use of $16.8 billion.
9) Increased greenhouse emissions that would be caused by the project; The EIS fails to analyse alternatives apart from 'doing nothing' that would have far less impact on emissions.
10) **Destruction of hectares of green space** across the entire Westconnex project, including critically endangered Cooks River Ironbark forest at Kingsgrove and parts of Sydney Park.
11) A failure to consult with businesses in King St Newtown and other parts of the Inner West. the whole project. The cumulative effect of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.
12) AECOM being paid $13 million to do this EIS after it has paid out millions for poor traffic modelling and has a **conflict of interest** due to its other Westconnex contracts.
13) The arrogant **EIS social impact study which dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines.**
14) An **inadequate air quality study** that has similar flaws to the M4 EIS study that has already been criticised by the NSW EPA and Health Department; and the plan to build unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness.

Please publish this submission with my name and suburb in accordance with an undertaking published on the Planning Department website

Name: Mary Poon Email: [redacted]

[redacted]

Suburb: Chippendale Postcode: 2008

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Liesha Hanekroot Email: lieshahk@gmail.com

Address: 11/108 Illawarra Rd

Suburb: Marrickville Postcode: 2204

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: SIMONE HEAPERMAN Email: s.heaperman@gmail.com

Address: 5 Ethel St

Suburb: ERSKINEVILLE Postcode: 2043

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Rob van der Waal Email: robvdw_85@hotmail.com

Address: 55 Forbes St

Suburb: Newtown Postcode: 2042

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: SEAN WALKER Email: seanwalks@hotmail.com

Address: 18/30 BUCKNELL ST

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode: 2042

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Bory Borg Email:

Address: 24 Brown st

Suburb: st, Peters Postcode: 2044

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Nicky Email: _____

Address: Leichardt

Suburb: _____ Postcode: 2040

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Kathryn Liu Email: liu_kathryn@yahoo.com.au

Address: 18/6 Waverton Avenue

Suburb: Waverton Postcode: 2060

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Kobie Tesoriero Email: _____

Address: 42A Karilla Ave

Suburb: Lane Cove Postcode: 2066

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: ANDREA LOGGENBERG Email: andrea.loggenberg@dllgroup.com

Address: 17 MELROSE ST.

Suburb: HURLSTONE PARK Postcode: 2193

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

3679

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: MARK WINSTANLEY Email: M-WIN@MAC.COM

Address: 43 FERN RD

Suburb: GLEBE Postcode: 2037

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Paul Holcombe Email: paul@urbane.com.au

Address: 71 Lawrence St,

Suburb: Alexandria Postcode: 2015

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

3681

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: G. Simonds Email: ggsimonds@hotmail.com

Address:

Suburb: Beverly Hills Postcode: 2209

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

3682

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: RALPH GODWIN Email: _____

Address: 24 RAWSON ST

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode: 2042

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: RACHEL GONZAGA Email: gstar74@yahoo.se

Address: 43 FERRY RD

Suburb: GLEBE Postcode: 2037

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: L. Heschl Email: roamingpa@me.com

Address: 5/27 Castlefield Street, Bondi

Suburb: BONDI Postcode: 2026.

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Kim Matthews Email: Kim_Matthews@icloud.com

Address: 11/22 Harrow Rd

Suburb: Stanmore Postcode: 2048

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Rosalea Cullen Email: rosiepig@yahoo.it

Address: 74 MARGARET ST

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode: 2042

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Tatjana Email: tatjanova@gmail.com

Address: 177/219 Mitchell Rd

Suburb: Erskineville Postcode: 2043

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: DR. KIM DUNSTAN Email: kim@[illegible].com.au

Address: PO. BOX 1305 POTTS POINT

Suburb: _____ Postcode: 1335

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Michael Sabbli Email: micsabbli@gmail.com

Address: 66 Armitree Street

Suburb: Kingsgrove Postcode: 2208

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Mark Sibbick Email: _____

Address: 19 Bishop St, St Peters

Suburb: St Peters Postcode: 2014

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: TOM McSWEENEY Email: TOMMACMC@HOTMAIL.COM

Address: 253B BELMONT ST

Suburb: ALEXANDRIA Postcode: 2015

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Matt Thistlethwaite Email: mcgal09@uowmail.edu.au

Address: 1 Chalford Avenue

Suburb: Canterbury Postcode: 2193

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: ALFRED BORG Email: _____

Address: 24 BROWN ST ST PETER'S

Suburb: _____ Postcode: 2044

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Alexander Wilks Email: alexanderjwilks@gmail.com

Address: 200 Elizabeth Street

Suburb: Croydon Postcode: 2132

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: NICHOLAS MITSAK Email: _____

Address: 8 Beach Road

Suburb: DULWICH HILL Postcode: 2203

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: L. CHADWICK Email:

Address: 60 HIGHGATE ST

Suburb: STRATHFIELD Postcode: 2135

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Guy Email: guy8thepie@hotmail.com

Address: 62 Dutruc street randwick

Suburb: randwick Postcode: 2031

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: YING LY Email: ying@yingly.net

Address: 57a WELLS ST

Suburb: NEWTOWN Postcode: 2042

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

The Secretary, NSW Dept of Planning and Environment, GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

I strongly object to the WestConnex New M5 proposal as outlined in its environmental impact statement (EIS). I also object to the entire WestConnex of which this is part.

This project will permanently destroy 11,000 square metres of Sydney Park, turn other large parts of it into construction compounds for years, and expose the rest of the park to vehicle fumes and noise. This area already has one the lowest amounts of public open space per person in Australia, and to destroy so much of for a toll road is unacceptable.

The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse. This EIS shows that local streets will not be able to cope with the increased traffic this project would cause unless other unplanned and unfunded toll road projects, including the M4-M5 Link, Sydney Gateway and southern extension, are built.

The manner in which scores of residents are being forced from their homes and businesses for this project's compulsory acquisitions is deeply unfair and undemocratic, particularly as it began long before this EIS was on display, let alone planning approvals granted.

According to the business case, Euston Road is supposed to handle 61,000 cars on 3 lanes each way. This is almost 10 times what it can handle on 2 lanes. There is no way it can handle 61,000 cars, however many lanes are added to it. This is just one of many local roads that will be subject to untenable traffic increases if the project proceeds.

Residents around the planned St Peters Interchange and exits at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills are already exposed to levels of air pollution that exceed national guidelines, yet the EIS predicts that these levels will only worsen.

The New M5 will lock residents of western and south-west Sydney into paying huge tolls and greater car dependency, rather than delivering the public transport and economic investment that is really needed in these areas.

Finally, I strongly object to the quality of the EIS. There is too little information on the traffic volumes that will occur in the areas around the St Peters Interchange and other parts around the New M5, as well as conflicting information on potential mitigation strategies.

It also fails to analyse alternative strategies that could move far more people and deliver bigger economic returns than the $16.8 billion WetsConnex, the cost of which is now blowing out at more than $2 billion a year. It is not acceptable that NSW and Federal taxpayers are being forced to fund this project and bear all the risk on it.

I call on your department to reject this proposal. I expect you to publish this submission and to acknowledge and respond to my objections in writing.

Name: Evan Hughes Email: evhughes@cisco.com

Address: 1/5 Allmon Ave

Suburb: Summer Hill Postcode: 2130